LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 27 1946
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CB425
.R81C4

ROSENBERG'S NAZI MYTH

BY ALBERT R. CHANDLER

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

BEAUTY AND HUMAN NATURE, 1934

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AESTHETICS
(with E. N. Barnhart), 1938

LARKS, NIGHTINGALES AND POETS, 1938

THE CLASH OF POLITICAL IDEALS, 1940

A. Rosenberg.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 27 1946
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ROSENBERG'S NAZI MYTH

ALBERT R. CHANDLER
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

ITHACA, NEW YORK
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
PRESS
1945

COPYRIGHT, 1945, BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA BY THE VAIL-BALLOU
PRESS, INC., BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

Frontispiece copyright 1930 by Hoheneichen-Verlag, München. Copyright vested in the Alien Property Custodian, 1942, pursuant to law. Reproduced by permission of the Alien Property Custodian in the public interest under License No. JA-797.

PREFACE

WE NEED to study Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century* because it helped to make the Germans what they are today. One of the greatest postwar problems is that of dealing with the German people—shall we try to intimidate them, conciliate them, or re-educate them? To approach this problem intelligently we need to understand the Nazi literature which deeply influenced the generation of Germans who came to maturity between the two world wars. In that literature Rosenberg's book ranks second only to *Mein Kampf*, and on some issues, including religion, it is far more explicit than Hitler's book.

Not only does Nazi literature help reveal to us the mind of contemporary Germany, but it should serve to put us on guard against similar tendencies in our own country. Nazi propaganda exploited national vanity, race hatreds, and religious hatreds to undermine democratic co-operation and impose totalitarian tyranny. America is not free from national vanity, race hatreds, and religious hatreds. Such hatreds have already been exploited at various times by the Ku Klux Klan, Father Coughlin, and numerous quasi-fascist organizations. Rosenberg's work is an outstanding example of a type of propaganda against which we must be on guard at home.

In spite of its importance *The Myth of the Twenti-*

eth Century has never been translated into English, and it has received only scanty discussion in English-speaking countries. To repair this omission, at least to some extent, is the aim of the present volume. A full exposition of Rosenberg's thought would require a large volume, and a full criticism would require the labors of an academy of scholars. However, Rosenberg's basic ideas are so fallacious, and his handling of details is so inaccurate, that an exhaustive study would be superfluous. It will be sufficient to expound and criticize the main features of his doctrine.

In the following pages I do not conceal my disapproval of Rosenberg's attacks on Jews and Catholics. This may lead some readers to wonder about my ancestry. Let me assure them that I do not know of any Jews in my family since Noah, nor of any Catholics since the Reformation. Furthermore, in being anti-Nazi one need not be anti-German. I cherish the memory of two semesters' study in Germany as one of the happiest and most fruitful experiences of my life. Everyone who wishes well to mankind should wish for the reconversion of the Germans from Nazism to saner and broader views.

Help in the preparation of this volume has come to me from many quarters. My colleagues at Ohio State University, Professors A. E. Avey, D. L. Evans, H. J. Grimm, J. A. Leighton, W. F. McDonald, and W. H. Reither, read an early draft of the manuscript and made valuable suggestions. Professors G. A. Briefs of Georgetown University, Hans Kohn of Smith College,

and R. J. Kroner of Union Theological Seminary read an early draft and gave me the benefit of their exceptional knowledge in this field. Vice President G. H. Sabine of Cornell University read and helpfully criticized a later draft. The staff of the Ohio State University Library, the staff of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, Dr. Anne B. Whitmer of Ohio State University, Rev. R. B. Blakney of Williamstown, and Rev. Placidus S. Kempf of St. Meinrad's Abbey, St. Meinrad, Indiana, helped me to locate needed materials. Father George Wolz of St. Charles Borromeo Seminary in Columbus, Ohio, very kindly gave me a copy of the rare and indispensable *Studien zum Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts.* A microfilm has been made from it, so that it may be available to other scholars. Mrs. Ruth Way Fliess gave valuable help in preparing the final draft. To all of these helpers I am very grateful.

Albert R. Chandler

Ohio State University
February, 1945

The reader should bear in mind that the manuscript of this book went to the printer before the surrender of Germany. He will find it a pleasant task to change many verbs from the present to the past tense.

A. R. C.

June, 1945

CONTENTS

Preface v

I THE MAN AND THE BOOK 3
The Importance of Rosenberg and His Book — Rosenberg's Background — The Book and Its Influence

II THE GREAT RACE 13
Race and History — The Ancient "Aryans" — The Teutons and Their Destiny

III THE ANTI-RACE 30
The Development of Jewry — The Protocols of Zion

IV CHRISTIANITY 42
Jesus and Paul — Teutonism versus Catholicism — Meister Eckhart's Mysticism

V PHILOSOPHY 61
Rosenberg a Philosopher? — Rosenberg's Favorite Thinkers — Theory of Knowledge — Race — Honor and Related Values — Religious Problems — Arts — Social Philosophy

VI CRITICISMS AND REBUTTALS 95
Controversy with Catholics — Catholicism and Anti-Semitism — Controversy with Protestants — The Outcome of the Controversy — Retrospect on the *Mythus*

VII ROSENBERG IN ACTION 116
His Personality and Status — Rosenberg, England, and Russia — Rosenberg and the Churches — Other Activities of Rosenberg

EPILOGUE 126

NOTES 130

Index 141

ROSENBERG'S NAZI MYTH

I

THE MAN AND THE BOOK

THE IMPORTANCE OF ROSENBERG AND HIS BOOK

HITLER'S *Mein Kampf* is the most important Nazi book, but Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century* is almost as important.[1] The two books lie together in the cornerstone of the Congress Hall in Nuremberg in which the Nazi party held its gatherings. Rosenberg is admittedly the most influential and representative intellectual leader of the party. He has been an intimate associate of Hitler from the early days of the party in Munich. Since 1921 he has been editor of the leading Nazi newspaper, the *Völkischer Beobachter;* in 1930 he published his *Myth of the Twentieth Century;* since 1931 he has edited the most important Nazi monthly, the *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte.*

On April 1, 1933, shortly after Hitler's accession to power, Rosenberg was appointed Director of the Foreign Policy Office of the party. This office supervised the attitude of the movement toward foreign policy; it also welcomed important foreign visitors, endeavoring to give them a favorable view of the regime. In January

of the following year Rosenberg was appointed to supervise the entire educational activity of the Nazi movement along intellectual, religious, and philosophical lines. His office also scrutinized all literary activity in the Reich. After 1936 Germans were no longer allowed to receive Nobel Prizes; instead National Prizes of 100,000 marks were established. The first to receive such a prize was Rosenberg.[2] He always wrote in favor of a policy hostile to Russia, and after the Nazi invasion of that country he was made civilian administrator of the conquered areas.

The offices and honors assigned to Rosenberg indicate that his writings are highly esteemed by Hitler.

ROSENBERG'S BACKGROUND

Rosenberg's background is not that of an ordinary German. He was born January 12, 1893, in Reval, now called Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, which was then a Russian province. The name Rosenberg does not make him Jewish, nor does his birth in Reval make him Russian. He is one of that group of Baltic Germans who have always felt themselves to be bringers of *Kultur* to barbarous Slavs. The Baltic Germans, constituting the upper stratum in a Slavic community, naturally develop a strong sense of their superiority as Germans. Rosenberg never had the wholesome experience of living among a foreign people with a sincere desire to learn from them and to gain a sympathetic insight into their way of life.

Apparently a precocious youth, Rosenberg early devoured many volumes of history and philosophy. At the age of fifteen he became acquainted with *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* by Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Chamberlain, an Englishman, was educated on the Continent. He married the daughter of Richard Wagner and adopted the racial ideas which Wagner had derived from Gobineau. The *Foundations*, published in 1899, is a long and heavy disquisition on history, religion, and politics on the basis of racial theory. It is more imaginative than critical, more eloquent than scholarly. It is the most influential exposition of Nordic superiority, anti-Semitism, and anti-Catholicism of its period.

Another strong influence on Rosenberg was Paul de Lagarde (1827–1891), who was a professor of oriental languages at Göttingen. He hated Catholicism, the Jews, and democracy. He advocated expansion into Poland and Russia. He proposed a "middle Europe" stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic and the Black seas. He suggested shipping the Jews to Madagascar.[3]

Rosenberg studied architecture in Riga and later in Moscow, mainly under German professors. His studies in history and philosophy were self-directed; it is therefore not surprising that his methods lack critical discipline. The influence of Chamberlain would conduce to bold generalizations, inspired by national prejudice and untrammeled by critical scruples.

Being a technical student, Rosenberg was not forced to serve in the Russian army during the First World

War. It appears that he resided in Paris for a time before the war ended; but whether or not he was a spy, and if so, for whom, remains a mystery.

All these circumstances conspired to build up an intense racial chauvinism, which found no outlet until he joined the Nazi party in Munich not long after its formation. It is therefore entirely natural that his work should consist of eloquent partisan propaganda, dressed up in voluminous but uncritical erudition rather than in critical scholarship or humane and broad-minded statesmanship. Rosenberg does not appear to be an insincere and cynical technician of propaganda like Goebbels, but a fanatic whose utterances derive force from his sincerity and zeal.

THE BOOK AND ITS INFLUENCE

Rosenberg entitled his most important book *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts, eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit* ("The Myth of the Twentieth Century, an Evaluation of Conflicting Mental and Spiritual Types in Our Time"). The term "myth" in this title does not mean something that is untrue, but something which is true in a profounder way than science or common sense. It means a view of life and nature that is accepted on faith and inspires social action. It is a kind of cult or religion or intuitive philosophy (458–466, 614–615, 698–700).[4]

The Myth of the Twentieth Century is evidently intended to become a classic. It stands apart from the

author's journalistic work: it is not concerned with the issues of a particular day. On the other hand, Rosenberg scorns the idea of *universal* truth. What he claims to present is the essential truth for Nordics, and especially Germans, in the twentieth century. This truth ought to be adequately expressed, since the author has used 701 pages—over one hundred and eighty thousand words—in the process. The book is no cool and cautious analysis of facts and principles; it glows with a passionate conviction regarding the character and destiny of the Nordic race, and summons Nordic men to mortal combat in behalf of Nordic ideals.

In the *Mythus* we find a melodramatic depiction of history as a perennial struggle between the glorious Nordic spirit and the corrupting influence of inferior races. The work is violently anti-Jewish and anti-Catholic: it attacks Communism, democracy, and high finance as devices of Jewry; it attacks Protestant churches for retaining too many Jewish and Catholic influences. It presents a philosophy combining the transcendentalism of Kant with the mysticism of the early Hindus and of Meister Eckhart. It claims to espouse an ethics of honor, loyalty, courage, and inner truthfulness, but interprets these terms in a peculiar Teutonic sense. It foreshadows a religion which shall combine the values of the Persian Zoroaster's God of Light, the heroic life of a Nordic Christ, and Meister Eckhart's God-in-the-breast. It sketches policies for the biological and spiritual regeneration of Germany and the expansion of German power. The myth of the

twentieth century is Nordic man's intuition of his own character and destiny, the cult of race and honor, to be given effective religious form by some spiritual leader yet to arise (601). It is a new phase of what Rosenberg calls "the eternal German dream" (458).

Intended as a classic, the *Mythus* has at least succeeded in becoming a best seller. In the five years following its publication in 1930, the publishers claim to have distributed over three hundred thousand copies.[5] Moreover, it seems to be on the way to becoming an official Bible. The Minister of Education, Rust, ordered it placed in the libraries of all schools above the elementary level.[6]

In his preface to the *Mythus* and in his replies to Catholic and Protestant attacks, Rosenberg states explicitly that he writes as an individual, not as an official of the party.[7] Yet after some years of controversy the powers of the government were used to suppress further attacks on Rosenberg's views.[8] Baldur von Schirach, the Reich Youth Leader, said on November 5, 1935, "Rosenberg's way is also the way of German youth."[9] This remark well summarizes the trend of education under the Nazi regime.

In this connection let me call attention to a characteristic rhythm of Nazi procedure. In the first phase, before the Nazi seizure of power, leaders of the movement proclaimed to the world extreme viewpoints and drastic policies. In the second phase, after their accession to power but while their position was still insecure, their utterances became conciliatory, and they en-

deavored to allay the suspicions and fears of their opponents. In the third phase they proceeded to act in accordance with their earlier extreme utterances. This action was sometimes gradual, in line with Hitler's observation that a shrewd victor will impose his will step by step, taking care that no step is sufficiently drastic to evoke serious opposition.[10] Or if advantage was to be gained by surprise, the action was sudden.

Thus Hitler—unofficially—in *Mein Kampf* proposed to crush France as a military power and then turn against Russia and the border states to conquer the living-space required by the Germans. After becoming the master of Germany Hitler—officially—declared, in a speech of June 1, 1933, "No new European War could bring anything better than the unsatisfactory situation of today," and his officials did their best to calm the fears of other nations, especially France and Poland.[11] But between 1933 and 1939 the Nazis took one step after another to put themselves in a position of military superiority to their neighbors. Each step, indeed, alarmed these neighbors, but no step was sufficiently drastic to provoke a preventive war. Finally the Nazis were strong enough to abandon the techniques of gradualness and conciliation, and to turn loose a *Blitzkrieg* upon Poland in 1939, France in 1940, and Russia in 1941.

Similarly, in the field of religion and culture Rosenberg—unofficially—announced a drastic and tyrannical Nordic world view and eloquently denounced Catholicism and traditional Protestantism. In emphasizing

the unofficial character of his book he stated that a movement which seeks political power and which includes persons of many religious creeds cannot solve problems of a religious or aesthetic nature, and consequently his world view must be considered purely personal.[12] In the light of subsequent events this seems to mean that the inner circle of Nazis welcomed the aid of Catholics and conservative Protestants in achieving power, but that when they had once achieved power, they would deal as they chose with Christian churches and the children of Christian parents.

As soon as Hitler came into power, his government proclaimed—officially—that it would "firmly protect Christianity as the basis of our whole moral system"; and in 1935 Hitler said, "The party never intended and does not intend today to combat Christianity in Germany in any way whatever. On the contrary, it has endeavored to create a great Evangelical Reich Church . . . without meddling in the slightest degree in confessional questions." [13] The Hitler government allayed the fears of Catholics by signing a concordat with the Pope on July 20, 1933.[14]

Yet by gradual processes the clergy was harassed; the religious work of Catholics and traditional Protestants was hampered; and steady pressure was exerted to promote such views as those of Rosenberg.[15] In 1935 Rosenberg adopted a harsh tone toward his critics, and he warned the Jesuits against trying the "patience" of present-day Germany too far.[16] In the same year adverse criticism of Rosenberg's *Mythus*, even in private teach-

ing, became a punishable offense. Meanwhile, there was a complex and long-drawn-out struggle between the Nazis and the "confessional" or conservative Protestant group for control of the Protestant church organization. The most spectacular feature of this struggle was the defiance of Nazi pressure by Pastor Niemöller and his confinement in a concentration camp.[17] The thirty-point program for the complete Germanization of all churches in the Reich, which was circulated in 1941, was even more drastic than Rosenberg's proposals in the *Mythus*.[18] (See p. 123 of this book.) It was not officially adopted, but it suggests the extremes to which Nazi policy might have gone. If a favorable opportunity had presented itself, the Nazis might have suppressed by force all religious activity of the traditional type.

Rosenberg's book is important to us because no other work so well describes the world view which the Nazis sought to impose upon Germans and which justifies in their own eyes their aggressive foreign policy. Hitler's appeal is to the masses; Rosenberg's appeal is to the educated classes. The *Mythus* is well adapted to win the minds and stir the hearts of young students who revere learning without being sufficiently well informed to detect Rosenberg's errors, and who are full of vague aspirations, although dissatisfied with conventional religion.

The work makes a dazzling display of erudition, which is combined with continual tension and excitement. It includes fascinating discussions of racial traits,

racial migrations, Hindu mysticism, the obscene myths of the Etruscans, the racial origin of Jesus, the perverse theology of Paul, the depredations of the Jews, the glorious achievements of Luther and Frederick the Great, the sinister activities of the Papacy, the corpse-like obedience of the Jesuits, the menaces of democracy, Marxism, the League of Nations, and international finance. There is never a dull moment, for all these apparently remote topics are given a lively application to current issues. Topics are taken up in the most unexpected order, yet the transitions seem natural as they occur. Reading the *Mythus* is like riding on a roller coaster. There are some steady ascents and gentle undulations, but these are interrupted by enough dizzy turns and hair-raising plunges to give us plenty of thrills for our money.

Nevertheless, it is far from Rosenberg's aim to give us merely temporary thrills. The fate of Nordic culture for ages to come is alleged to hang upon the acceptance of his views. He is constantly exhorting German youths to redeem their fatherland by liquidating the Jews, rejecting traditional types of Christianity, and pursuing purely Nordic ideals.

II

THE GREAT RACE

RACE AND HISTORY

THE core of Rosenberg's book is his racial interpretation of history. Let me at once warn the reader that his conception of race is not accepted by the most scientific anthropologists and that his interpretation of history is not accepted by scholarly historians.

Some anthropologists have found it convenient to classify men as White, Black, Brown, Yellow, and Red. They have then classified whites as Nordic (tall, blond, long-headed), Alpine (short, brunet, short-headed), and Mediterranean (short, brunet, long-headed). Other anthropologists combine some of these groups; still others make more numerous subdivisions. The most frequent bases for division are the color of the skin, eyes, and hair, the stature, and the ratio between the length and the breadth of the head. Numerous other anatomical differences may be used, including the shape of the nose, the prominence of the cheek bones, the straightness or curliness of the hair, the amount of body hair, and the mongolian fold which gives some Orientals their slant-eyed appearance.[19]

At any given time various mental traits may appear

to be more frequent, or stronger, in one of these so-called "races" than another. But mental traits are so much affected by local and historical conditions that it is impossible to disentangle the effects of heredity from those of historical and geographical influences. It is therefore unscientific to assert with Rosenberg and Hitler that one race has a pervasive and unchangeable superiority to others in the traits which produce and enhance civilization.

The racialism of Hitler and Rosenberg in Germany, as well as that of Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard in America, is derived from the writings of Gobineau, Wagner, and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, no one of whom was either a competent biologist or a well-trained historian. The racial doctrines of these men have much the same relation to anthropology and history as astrology has to astronomy. Rosenberg reveres Chamberlain as "a man of world-embracing culture, whose mode of thought united boldness with the greatest caution."[20] Chamberlain was influenced by the dilettante French nobleman, Comte de Gobineau. Gobineau, in turn, was influenced by Anglo-Saxon apologists for Negro slavery.[21] In the present war, descendants of Virginian and Jamaican slaveholders have been bombed and torpedoed by race-conscious disciples of Rosenberg. Thus do chickens come home to roost.

A recent work by M. F. Ashley Montagu argues that even among anthropologists there are those who do not realize how fully the modern study of heredity has discredited the concept of "race." The idea of race implies

that sets of traits are bound together and persist unaltered through the ages. The study of heredity refutes this idea by showing that the unit of inheritance is the *gene*, of which every individual possesses a vast number; these genes are mostly independent of one another; an inexhaustible variety of combinations among physical and mental traits is possible; the genes themselves are subject to mutation, so that no traits are unchangeable; and mental traits depend more on experience than on heredity.[22]

When we turn to history we find that, even if the ordinary distinction among races is retained, an impartial survey refutes the claim of Rosenberg and Hitler that the Nordic "race" has a unique power to create and enhance civilizations. Toynbee, for instance, distinguishes twenty-one civilizations and the races which initiated them, as follows: [23]

CIVILIZATION	*RACES WHICH CREATED IT*
Hellenic	White (Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean)
Western	Ditto
Egyptiac	White (Alpine and Mediterranean)
Sumeric	Ditto
Minoan	Ditto
Indic	White (Nordic) and Brown
Hittite	White (Nordic and Alpine)
Far Eastern (in Korea and Japan)	White (Polynesian) and Yellow
Orthodox Christian (main body)	White (Alpine and Mediterranean)

Orthodox Christian (in Russia)	White (Nordic and Alpine)
Iranic	White (Alpine and Mediterranean)
Babylonic	White (Mediterranean)
Syriac	Ditto
Arabic	Ditto
Hindu	Brown
Sinic	Yellow
Far Eastern (main body)	Yellow
Andean	Red
Mayan	Red
Yucatec	Red
Mexic	Red

It will be seen that in Toynbee's opinion the white race has helped to produce many civilizations, but the Nordic branch is concerned with only five of the twenty-one, the Alpine with nine, and the Mediterranean with ten. Moreover, seven civilizations arose without the participation of any branch of the white race. The civilizations whose names are italicized in the table seem to have arisen without the aid of any previous civilization. These are the Egyptiac, Sumeric, and Minoan, each of which originated in a combination of Alpine and Mediterranean populations, the Sinic (yellow), the Andean and Mayan (both red). If the Indic civilization was not derived from the Sumeric, it should be added to this list.[24] It would then be the only underived civilization which the Nordics helped to form. Thus if race *were* the creative factor, the

Nordics would appear inferior to the Alpine, Mediterranean, yellow, and red races in originative power.

Since populations of every race have continued for thousands of years *without* creating a civilization, and since the civilizations which have emerged were the work of *parts* of various races or *combinations* of races, it seems proper to accept Toynbee's conclusion: "The upshot of our inquiry is to discredit the hypothesis of a natural law in which the creation of civilizations is supposedly revealed as the peculiar racial function of particular branches of the human family." [25]

Kolnai, in *The War against the West*, very properly remarks:

> Categories like "Aryan" and "Semitic" are not racial in the more exact ethnological use of the term. They rest on a compound of linguistic, historical, racial, religious and political data and correlations. The Nazi mind bears little grudge against the Magyars and even the Japanese for not being "Aryans"; it bears no ill will to the Arabs for being "Semites." It is almost the sole purpose of these polemic doctrines to give an air of scientific validity to the disqualification of Jews, in the second place of negroes, and occasionally of Christian orthodoxy.[26]

We may add that the racial theory has not only this function of rationalizing group prejudices, but of feeding German vanity and justifying German aggression. Furthermore, in Rosenberg's case hostility to orthodox Christianity is a prominent motive, and he has a special hostility to the Russians (206–214).

THE ANCIENT "ARYANS"

Rosenberg has much to say of the "Aryans" as the race which created the cultures of the ancient world. But he gives no precise definition of the Aryans or of any other race. His Aryans are apparently identical with the Nordic branch of the white race, or at least include it. Whenever he finds evidence of tall, blond conquerors of darker, shorter races, he straightway assumes that the conquerors were Aryans. The Aryan race, he thinks, spread out in successive waves from some northwestern homeland and gave the initial impulse to great cultural achievements in Egypt, India, Persia, Greece, and Rome. Within the Aryan race he lays emphasis upon the Nordic or Teutonic tribes: *die Germanen, nordische Stämme.* These were the Goths, Vandals, Lombards, Franks, Saxons, and others, who wandered over Europe in early centuries of the Christian era. Rosenberg credits them with laying the foundations of all modern European states. Among the Nordics his emphasis naturally falls upon the modern Germans: *die Deutschen.*

In the following pages I shall summarize Rosenberg's account of these historical developments without stopping on every page to say, "This is unscientific."

The foundation of Egyptian civilization is attributed to the warlike Amorites, described by Sayce as light-skinned and blue-eyed. Rosenberg thinks they came by way of north Africa, and that the blond Berbers in

Algeria today are their descendants. Among the four races of Egypt depicted on Theban tombs are the "Libyans," who always have beards, blue eyes, and white skins. Pausanias, early in the Christian era, still found "blond Libyans" (26–27).

Similarly, the foundation of the civilization of ancient India with its caste system is attributed to Aryans who flowed over the mountains from the northwest. They contrasted their own light complexions with those of the dark-brown subject races—"Varna" means not only "caste" but "color" (28). These Aryans created the profound philosophy of the Vedas and Upanishads. The Hindu aristocrat felt his own soul expand to coincide with the living breath of the universe and felt the universal spirit stirring within him as his inmost self. Eventually, race mixture destroyed the racial basis of this doctrine. Systems of magic and sacrifices, derived from the subject races, corrupted Aryan mysticism. The monistic idea was carried to such an extreme that race and personality sank to the status of illusions, and India lost its creative power. Now her "wretched bastards" seek in the waters of the Ganges some healing for their crippled lives. (29–31).

The Aryan Persians are described as spreading over Iran in the sixth century B.C. There Zoroaster founded a truly Aryan religion. Ahura-Mazda, God of Light and protector of Aryans, has no house like Oriental deities but is identified with holy wisdom, perfection, and immortality. Against him the dark Ahriman struggles for mastery of the world, and in true Nordic fashion man

is summoned to fight on the side of Ahura-Mazda, "just as the *Einherier* in Walhalla fight on Odin's side against the Fenris wolf and the Midgard serpent." (*Einherier* are souls of warriors slain in battle.) Such a religion does not encourage asceticism and contemplation, but bids man serve a creative principle in his actions, whether he sows or reaps or loyally keeps his word. Although Zoroaster had sought to keep the conquering race pure, race mixture could not be avoided, and Persian power declined (32, 33).

The creation of Hellenic culture is attributed to successive waves of invaders from the Danube Valley. Such were the Achaeans, later the Dorians, and finally the Macedonians. Aristocratic standards hindered race mixture, and the dominant race was strengthened by the successive Nordic invasions. But at last the dark Asiatic blood diluted the blond Nordic strains, and Greeks were replaced by modern Levantines, who are Greek only in name (34–35).

Let me note at this point that more competent scholars are not so dogmatic as Rosenberg with reference to the Athenians. Pittard, in his *Race and History*, writes:

> Would it not greatly interest historians, philosophers, and artists—the whole world in fact—to know to what race belonged the admirable sculptors, sages, orators, military chiefs and great politicians of ancient Greece? Yet we are quite in the dark about it. We can only guess, and of what value are guesses? [27]

To Rosenberg, however, guesses seem to be of great value, if he finds them in the writings of H. S. Chamberlain, and if they serve to glorify the Nordic race.

Blue-eyed Athene and golden-haired Apollo are regarded by Rosenberg as creations of the splendid Nordic racial soul. Apollo is god of the dawn, protector of inner vision and prophetic gifts, god of song and of rhythmic but not ecstatic dance; on his Delphic temple stood the words, "Nothing in excess" and "Know thyself." In the cult of the Olympic deities we see more clearly than anywhere else the spontaneous Nordic rejection of magical practices. Every genuine line of the *Iliad* and every temple of Hellas displays the qualities of the best race (35–36).

But in contrast to the Nordic deities of light and heaven, there emerge earthy deities of the lower races: Demeter, Hermes, bloody Ares, and Dionysos, god of ecstasy, lust, and unrestrained orgies (36). Thus Greek intellectual development proceeds on two levels (50). On the higher level Plato's doctrine of Ideas expresses in philosophical terms what the Olympic deities symbolized in religious forms (50). But Rosenberg sees only evidences of inferior racial souls in the number cabalism of the Pelasgian Pythagoras (49), and in Socrates' abandonment of the study of organic processes in favor of abstract intellectual discussion (284, 286). Socrates was guilty of turning away from the racial nobility of Hellenism to the abstract idea of humanity at large and a community of "good" men (283–285).

His physical traits (bulging forehead, flat nose, protruding eyes, thick lips, and heavy body) are characteristic of the non-Greek inferior races (283–284).[28] Under the weight of democratic institutions, disastrous wars, mystery cults, and abstract intellectualism, Greece sank lower and lower. In the Roman period, instead of proud Athenians we find "Greeklings" devoid of character, purveying a superficial culture to the Roman masters who despised them (288).

Rome is said to owe its initial impetus to a wave of Nordic migration into Italy, that broke the power of the Oriental Etruscans and blended with the unspoiled local Mediterranean race. There resulted a character, dominated by Nordic influence, which displayed the greatest firmness and tenacity, and which united shrewd sense with iron energy in the life of peasants, lords, and heroes. History can tell us little of the earliest period in which the power was stored up, only to be lavishly wasted in later centuries. Surrounded by seafaring Oriental races, Rome ruthlessly asserted itself with its short sword. In destroying Carthage it performed a deed of great importance for racial history by freeing the subsequent life of middle and western Europe from the influences of the pestiferous Phoenician horde (54–55). Rosenberg thinks world history might have taken a very different course if the centers of Syrian and Semitic-Jewish life had been destroyed like Carthage, but "the deed of Titus came too late"; the Oriental parasite was no longer confined to Jerusalem, which

Titus destroyed, but had spread through the Hellenistic and Roman world (55–56).

Rome took the first step toward racial chaos by permitting, in the fifth century B.C., the intermarriage of patricians and plebeians. In later centuries plebeian influence grew, and renegade patricians like the Gracchi promoted democratic tendencies. Nevertheless truly Nordic figures stood forth from time to time, like the elder and younger Catos, the blue-eyed, vigorous Sulla, and Augustus. In the Empire good and bad rulers succeeded one another, achieving power through control of the Pretorian guards or leadership of a hungry mob. The powerful racial forces of early Rome had been nearly exhausted by four hundred years of race-disintegrating democracy. Spaniards and Africans became Emperors. At last the disgusting Caracalla, whose Syrian mother was daughter of a priest of Baal in Asia Minor, gave Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire in 212 A.D. (56–58).

The cults of all races were practiced in Rome (58–59). Rosenberg especially condemns the obscene myths, temple prostitution, and cruel human sacrifices of the Etruscans, to whose influence he attributes much of the priestcraft, magical practices, and belief in witchcraft which the Catholic church, as inheritor of late Roman cults, spread through medieval Europe (60–67).

To Rome, in this condition of raceless degradation, Christianity preached a doctrine of sin and grace. To

a people of healthy race, the doctrine of original sin would be incomprehensible. The sense of sin was unknown to Homer's heroes, to the ancient Hindus, to the Teutons of Tacitus and the *Dietrichssage*. But race pollution leads to divided characters, lack of direction in thought and action, and a sense of degradation. The persistent sense of sin is a by-product of physical bastardization. The chaos of races in the Roman world yearned for grace (70–71). This yearning was satisfied, not by the simple gospel of Jesus, but by the complex system which Paul and his successors developed. This included the virgin birth, the miraculous expulsion of devils and calming of storms, the resurrection of Christ after his death by torture, and his ascension to heaven (77–78).

Rosenberg's bizarre explanation of the sense of sin would be important if true. American experience does not indicate that mulattoes have a greater sense of sin than Negroes or whites. The New England Puritans had an acute sense of sin, but their descendants threw it off under the leadership of Emerson without any preliminary purification of race.

THE TEUTONS AND THEIR DESTINY

For Rosenberg a new phase of history is initiated by the contact of Teutonic tribes with the Roman world. This began with the invasion of Italy by the Cimbri about 100 B.C. and resulted in a partial rejuvenation of the Italian population through the infusion of Nordic

blood. The Cimbri were followed by other invaders, and Marcus Aurelius settled captives from Vienna as peasants on Italian soil. The fidelity of Teutonic soldiers became the chief reliance of the Caesars, and Constantine's army was almost wholly Teutonic. Theodoric, the Lombards, and the Normans continued the work which culminated in the foundation of the first secular state by Emperor Frederick II in Sicily. In north Italy Theodoric had settled two hundred thousand Teutonic families, who gave the region a permanently different character from south Italy. Later, the Renaissance, emerging in north Italy, was an exhilarating expression of Teutonic blood, but "Africanized" south Italy remained mute and uncreative. Today, Fascism, originating in north Italy, is an attempt to revive the old Nordic values, but Rosenberg repeats skeptically, "an attempt" (80–81).

Here again let me note that Pittard's view is entirely different, for he finds little trace of Germanic types anywhere in Italy.[29]

Rosenberg credits the wandering Teutonic tribes with laying the foundations for all the modern states of Europe—for France and Spain as well as for the German and Scandinavian states and England (81, 83). Toynbee rejects such views. He points out that the states founded by Vandals, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Gepidae, and Lombards perished by violence before the modern pattern of states emerged. The only exceptions were Frankish Austrasia, the nucleus of the Carolingian empire from which France and the Ger-

man states were later derived, and Wessex, which became the nucleus of the English kingdom. Toynbee stresses the function of the Church as the mother of modern European states.[30]

The antagonists of these creative Teutons are described as a "racial chaos." This was the group of mixed races which inhabited the shores of the Mediterranean in late Roman and medieval times. They displayed remnants of Hellenic and Roman culture combined with morbid superstitions and ecstatic tendencies of Oriental origin (82). Roman Catholicism, with its universal religion disregarding racial differences and its continuation of the Roman imperial tradition, was one aspect of this movement (81–83). In part the Teutonic peoples were duped into accepting the universalistic religious and political ideals which belonged to the racial chaos. Both the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire served antinational ideals. The Teutons, not sufficiently conscious of the implications of their own spiritual nature, were dazzled by these ideas and often became their most effective supporters (84–85).

The Papacy and world monarchy were opposed, in behalf of political nationalism, by Luther, by England, France, Scandinavia, and Prussia; the rebirth of Germany in 1813 and again in 1871 were further stages in the process. Not until the collapse of 1918 was the full significance of the struggle revealed. Then Germans began to realize that nationalism transcends distinctions of tribes, dynasties, and religious creeds. Nationalism is loyal to the basic nature of the folk, and its goal

is to bring out all that is noble and expel all that is ignoble (85).

This ideal of the *folk* is the central theme of Nazi doctrine as expounded in *Mein Kampf* and the *Mythus*. A folk or people (*Volk*) is a body of men united by racial and cultural ties. It does not necessarily correspond to the state organization of a given period. Thus the German-speaking Austrians were always part of the German *Volk*, even when artificially linked with Slavs and Magyars under the Hapsburg monarchy. On the other hand, the folk may include different racial strains; the Germans themselves include a large mass of Alpines as well as Nordics, yet the Nordic strain is supposed to be somehow dominant in German *Kultur*. The members of a folk do not necessarily occupy contiguous territory. Germans who have migrated to America or the Orient are still considered part of the German folk.

The complex history of this ideal, as developed by Herder, Fichte, and many others, has been traced by R. D'O. Butler in his excellent work, *The Roots of National Socialism*. Since World War I, and more especially since 1930, this ideal has been expressed in a copious literature. Aurel Kolnai surveys some two hundred volumes of such Nazi or semi-Nazi literature in his *War Against the West*.

Rosenberg finds the high points of Germanic achievement in recent centuries in Bach, Frederick the Great, Kant, Bismarck, and Moltke. Frederick the Great displayed the ideal of honor in action; Kant formulated

the principle of duty; and Bismarck built up the Second Reich, although his concessions to liberalism contributed to its subsequent destruction. Moltke's work on the general staff developed the type of officer who united discipline with initiative and made possible the military achievements of the first World War (517–520).

The nucleus of the Third Reich will have to consist of persons who unite Frederick's sense of honor, Moltke's system of discipline, and "Bismarck's holy will" (521). The nationalism of the period 1813–1918 was impaired by antiquated dynastic institutions, economic organization for profit, and enervating humanitarianism (215). Germany in that period erred in attempting to support its people by industrialization and international trade instead of conquering land on which they might raise their own food (637). The Third Reich must have the strength of will to create space for millions of future Germans (638). Rosenberg speaks of 100 million Germans for whom space must be provided (676). Hitler speaks of space in which 250 million Germans may be self-supporting within a century.[31]

Rosenberg gives an extensive discussion of the proper distribution of territory throughout the world to states organized on a racial basis. These should each have an organic economic life, free from international finance, but in "symbiosis" with one another (675). The chief features of this system include a German-Scandinavian block, defending north Europe against Communism; an alliance of this block with England, which should

retain control of India; a block in the Mediterranean led by Italy; dominance of the white race in North America; and a system of yellow states in the Far East which should not impair the vital interests of North America and Europe (676).

Rosenberg wishes to see the power of France reduced because he dislikes its democratic ideas, its Alpine racial elements, and its African soldiery (638–640, 646–647). He demands that the United States abandon the democratic ideas of its founders, reminding us that Washington was a Mason. He demands that we curb the growth of our great cities, transfer our Asiatic possessions to Japan, expel our "niggers" and "yellows," and join Europe in sending the Jews to some region where this whole "folk" can find a place (668–670, 673). He wishes an alliance of Great Britain, Spain, and Italy to control the western Mediterranean (666). Such was Rosenberg's vision in 1930 of a world made safe for Nordics, within which they might develop the *Kultur* suitable to their unique capacities.

Rosenberg gives no adequate reasons for holding that a stable and peaceful world could be established on a basis of racial groupings and isolated economic units. He recognizes no rights of minorities; he has no pity for the woes of transplanted populations. His proposals are probably impractical and certainly ruthless.

III

THE ANTI-RACE

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWRY

THE villain in Rosenberg's dramatization of history is the Jew. He is the opposite of the Nordic in all respects. In contrast to the noble, creative, and constructive Nordic, he is ignoble, parasitic, and destructive. Rosenberg asserts that the Jews are not properly a race, but an ancient racial mixture which has preserved its character by religious laws against intermarriage with other groups. He accepts from Arno Schickedanz' *Sozialparasitismus im Völkerleben* the conception of the Jews as an "anti-race" since their parasitic activity leads to the preservation of only those hereditary strains adapted to parasitism (461–462).

Rosenberg systematically ignores everything good in the character and achievements of the Jews. He systematically attributes to them all sorts of evils, whether he finds some slender basis in fact or whether he relies on sheer fiction, as in the case of the notorious *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion.*

Rosenberg denies to the Jews some of the chief glories of their own tradition. According to him the founders of Jerusalem were not Jews but a tall, blond,

Nordic race, the Amorites, who later mixed their race with the local Philistines (27). He does not admit that the Jews were original in theology. At first they thought of their own national god as looking after their welfare, without doubting the existence of similar gods of other nations. Only under Persian influence did they learn to think of their god as ruling the whole universe, though opposed by an evil power, Satan (127). From the Persian way of preserving a natural race they derived their system of preserving a racial mixture (33).

Since Jehovah's operations are merely material, his worship is interwoven with lust for wealth and dreary superstition, as shown in the Old Testament, the Talmud, and the writings of Karl Marx (127–128). The idea of immortality is lacking in the Old Testament, except where the influence of the Persians is evident. The Talmud and other Jewish writings elaborate the dream of a paradise on earth, in which the righteous (Jews) shall rise from the tomb to rule over other nations and enslave their peoples. Then fruit will ripen every month; the wind will harvest the grain without human labor; and pearls will grow on hedges (363). This old dream takes a new form in the glorious state of the future which Jewish Marxism foretells (363–364).

This religious sanction of materialism explains the prevalence of avarice and the dearth of creative power among the Jews of all periods. In their artistic endeavors they achieve technical skill and seek striking effects on the audience (364–365). In the Psalms Rosenberg

finds only trembling fear, anxiety in triumph, and panting desire for vengeance (364–365).

In condemning the Psalms Rosenberg may be thinking of such passages as Psalm 6:6:

> I am weary with my groaning; all the night make I my bed to swim, I water my couch with my tears.

or Psalm 38:3–8:

> There is no soundness in my flesh because of thine anger; neither is there any rest in my bones because of my sin. . . . My wounds stink and are corrupt because of my foolishness. . . . My loins are filled with loathsome disease: and there is no soundness in my flesh. I am feeble and sore broken: I have roared by reason of the disquietness of my heart.

Possibly he thinks of the curses in Psalm 109:9–12, 16–17:

> Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually vagabonds and beg: let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places. Let the extortioner catch all that he hath; and let the strangers spoil his labour. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him: neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children.

These woes, which the Psalmist rhetorically invokes, have been actually inflicted by the Nazis upon multitudes of innocent victims. And why did the Psalmist invoke these curses? Because the victim was of a different race? No, but

> Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the

broken in heart. As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.

The spirit is not one of unprovoked cruelty but of retribution.

The Psalmist does not expect divine favor because of his blood but because of his righteousness, as in Psalm 7: 3–8:

. . . If there be iniquity in my hands; if I have rewarded evil unto him that was at peace with me; . . . let the enemy persecute my soul, and take it; yea, let him tread down my life upon the earth, and lay mine honour in the dust. . . . The Lord shall judge the people: judge me, O Lord, according to my righteousness, and according to mine integrity that is in me.

In the same Psalm (7: 14–16) it is said of the wicked man,

Behold, he travaileth with iniquity, and hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood. He made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealing shall come down upon his own pate.

Obviously, such passages are not agreeable reading for anti-Semites.

Here, as elsewhere, Rosenberg ignores the best aspects of what he would condemn. His case against the Psalms would collapse if he were to quote from Psalm 103: 1–18:

Bless the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me, bless his holy name. . . . The Lord executeth righteousness and

judgment for all that are oppressed. . . . The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. . . . Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust. As for man, his days are as grass: as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more. But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting . . . to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them.

It is not only in the Psalms that Rosenberg finds occasion to condemn Jewish authors. He dismisses Heine with the single adjective *niederträchtig*, that is, base or malicious (364). This judgment runs counter to the sentiments of several generations of Germans who have loved the lyrics of Heine. Many of these lyrics were set to music by Schumann, Schubert, and other impeccably German composers, who evidently found nothing alien or contemptible in them. These songs became favorites on the concert stage and in the home. In spite of Nazi propaganda against Jewish authors the Germans cannot give up Heine's "Lorelei"; it has been printed in a songbook as "of unknown authorship."

Rosenberg asserts that because the Jews are both avaricious and uncreative they are invariably parasitic. They feed on the racial and creative forces of some other race until it perishes. Although they proclaim a distant Utopia, they tend to destroy all actually constructive forms of social life, which for Rosenberg must have a basis in race and soil. The Jew is an eternal denier

of life, as brilliantly depicted in Goethe's Mephistopheles (459–460).

The "God" who is said to have chosen this "people" is, of course, the God who resembles them. Had they made statues or paintings of him, Rosenberg thinks that the Old Testament could never have gained acceptance in Europe (462). The masters of European painting have never attempted to depict the might and glory of the Deity by means of a Jewish countenance or figure. You need only imagine, he says, "a face with a crooked nose, pendulous lip, piercing black eyes, and woolly hair" to see the utter impossibility of depicting the European God in such a fashion (294).

Through the myth of the world rule of Jehovah, through the racial exclusiveness of Ezra, through the discipline of the Talmud, the Jews have developed a community of blood and temperament of tremendous resistive power. Since the influence of the Talmud has declined, the idea of Zionism has arisen to perpetuate their cohesive and anti-European endeavor. Rosenberg thinks the effort to build a Jewish state, complete with peasants, industrial laborers, soldiers, and statesmen, runs counter to all the parasitic instincts of this anti-race. At most, the new community in Palestine can only be a center of influence to strengthen the Jews' parasitic activity in other lands (462–465).

Rosenberg declares that the "financial science" practiced by stock exchanges is a purely Jewish device for perverting, upsetting, and exploiting the economic life of nations; he regards it as the cause of the economic

woes of Nordic nations, and cites the Dawes Plan as one of its evil works (123). Thus Rosenberg joins Hitler in condemning both Marxism and international finance as deadly perils to Germanic life, and in viewing both as Jewish plots.[32] He does not, however, sink to the level of Hitler's depiction of the Jewish rapist lying in wait for the German maiden.[33] He says that the law of the Third Reich must adopt Lagarde's attitude toward the Jews: "One can't educate trichinae, but must make them harmless as quickly as possible" (591). Note the subtle sadism of the quip which not only describes the Jews as parasites, but associates them with pork—and prescribes their destruction. Whenever Rosenberg touches on the Jews, his pen spurts vitriol. He does not explicitly propose such mass murders as the Nazis have committed since the conquest of Poland, but he goes far toward preparing his readers' minds for such a policy.

THE PROTOCOLS OF ZION

For a full discussion of the Jewish question Rosenberg refers us to four of his minor works (466), but he does not mention his edition of *The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*.[34] That is strange, because the Protocols have been one of the chief weapons of anti-Semitic propaganda in the twentieth century. One author has said that "they cost the lives of thousands of innocent persons and that more blood and tears cling to their pages than to those of any other mendacious

document in the world's history." [35] This should not be taken to mean that the Protocols by themselves could cause pogroms. They are too absurd to influence anyone who is not already prejudiced against the Jews. But they are well adapted to intensify anti-Jewish prejudice by supplying it with an elaborate justification. While the present volume is primarily concerned with the *Mythus*, Rosenberg's use of the Protocols also deserves consideration.

The Protocols ostensibly contain the minutes of a series of secret meetings of Jewish leaders, in which plans are outlined for the subjection of the whole world to a Jewish monarch. They were first printed in Russian, different versions appearing in 1903 and later years. In 1920 English versions appeared in England and the United States. After that they appeared in most of the important languages of the world.

It is impossible to summarize the Protocols because of their incoherent and fantastic nature. I will try to give the reader an impression of their contents by culling a number of characteristic ideas from them. Numbers in parentheses here refer to pages in the Small, Maynard and Company edition of 1920.

The Jews are said to have caused the French Revolution (21). They engineered the successes of Darwinism, Marxism, and Nietzscheism (17). They work through Masonic lodges everywhere, but kill Masons who know too much in ways that elude all suspicion (22, 47, 50). They control the world's gold (20). They control the world's press (17–18). Democratic catchwords such as liberty, equality, fraternity unloose the

power of the blind mob (15). For the Jews, "Politics have nothing in common with morals," and "Our right lies in might" (13); also, "Our motto is Power and Hypocrisy" (14). Constitutional government promotes wrangling and inefficiency and thus serves Jewish ends (35). The Jews pose as saviors of the common people by inducing them to join the Socialists, Anarchists, and Communists (19). They spread an all-embracing terror and have persons of all opinions and all parties in their service (31). They distort laws through contradictory interpretations (32). They promote "insane, dirty and disgusting literature" (46). They promote freedom of religion, undermine the churches by criticism and dissension, and expect to achieve the early collapse of Christianity (56–57). By promoting conflicts of opinion in politics, they will confuse the Gentiles to the point that they give up forming political opinions (26). They will cause dissension and hatred throughout Europe; if necessary they will provoke a world war in order to achieve universal power (28). They provoke financial panics (20). Hungry mobs will sweep away all opposition when the time comes for the Jewish universal ruler to be crowned (20). They have kept their plan secret through many centuries (45). The Jews' government will have a large corps of economic, legal, and other experts to control the Gentiles by playing upon their tendencies, failings, vices, and virtues (29). "The King of Israel will become the real Pope of the Universe" (57).

The fictitious character of the Protocols had always been evident to any unprejudiced reader, but it was positively established in 1921. In that year Philip P. Graves, correspondent of the London *Times* in Constantinople, received from a Russian landowner a book which he had bought from an officer of the former political police of the Czar. This book was a French

work by Maurice Joly, a *Dialogue in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu; or, the Politics of Machiavelli in the Nineteenth Century.* This was a satire on the tyranny of Napoleon III, published in 1865; the author had to go to jail for it. It had nothing to do with the Jews. Nevertheless, the parallels between it and the Protocols are so numerous and so close as to prove that a large part of the latter was derived from it.

Graves pointed out the derivation of the Protocols from the *Dialogue* in the London *Times* of August 16, 17, and 18, 1921. His conclusions were confirmed and amplified by other writers including Benjamin Segel, whose work appeared in Berlin in 1924.[36]

Rosenberg's edition of the Protocols first appeared in 1923. The edition which I have seen is that of 1933. He does not publish a full text. Instead, he surrounds selected sentences and paragraphs from the text with extensive commentaries of his own, endeavoring to force his own interpretation on the reader. The trend of his discussion is to show that the Jews caused the French Revolution, the World War, and many other evils, and that they covertly and openly exercise great financial and political power.

In discussing the authenticity of the Protocols Rosenberg does not mention the revelation in the London *Times*, nor the work of Segel. He acknowledges that there are resemblances to Joly's *Dialogue*, but argues that Joly was a Jew, for which there is no evidence. Even if Joly had been a Jew, that would not make his *Dialogue* anything but an attack on Napoleon III.

Rosenberg further asserts that there are plenty of Jewish documents old and new which show the same spirit as the Protocols, and that the activities of the Zionists point in the same direction. His whole argument is flimsy and evasive.[37]

If Rosenberg was aware of the exposure in the London *Times* of 1921, he should have refrained from publishing *The Protocols* in 1923. He can scarcely have remained unaware of Segel's study, which appeared in Berlin in 1924; this should have deterred him from permitting subsequent editions to appear. Instead, the study of the book is required in German schools. Perhaps his attitude is like that which Rauschning attributes to Hitler—indifference to literal authenticity but acceptance of the document as expressing Jewish spirit. According to Rauschning, Hitler claims to have learned useful lessons from the Protocols—"political intrigue, the technique of conspiracy, revolutionary subversion, prevarication, deception, organization." [38]

In recent years various writers have dealt with the Protocols. Valentin and Levinger give good accounts of their use in anti-Jewish propaganda.[39] Curtiss gives a full and authoritative discussion of their origins in *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion*.[40] He states that one hundred and seventy-six points of resemblance between the Protocols and Joly's *Dialogue* have been detected, and he demonstrates many of these by printing material from the two books in parallel columns. Curtiss' study is sponsored by a group of leading American historians. It is an excellent piece of work, but belated.

The historians should have tackled the problem twenty years ago when Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent* was spreading this poisonous propaganda throughout the nation.

Anti-Semitism is only one phase of the complex interplay between Jews and Gentiles in recent centuries. The present tensions between these groups are due in part to more or less remote historical causes, in part to the day-to-day behavior of members of both groups. Neither side can be declared guiltless. But the use of the Protocols to stir up fear and hatred of the Jews is perhaps the most disgraceful scandal of the twentieth century.

IV

CHRISTIANITY

JESUS AND PAUL

LIKE all Rosenberg's views, his interpretation of Jesus and Christianity has a racial background. To understand it we must begin with his story of the blond and warlike Amorites, who constituted one of the waves of Aryan migration from the northwest. They made their way along the African coast of the Mediterranean and played an important role in the development of Egypt. They founded Jerusalem and formed the Nordic stratum in Galilee, "the Gentile district" from which Jesus eventually sprang (26–27). Rosenberg does not quite dare to assert that Jesus was a Nordic, but he evidently wishes us to believe that he was.

The Protestant scholar Künneth, in criticizing Rosenberg, describes the situation in Galilee as follows:

> From 732 B.C. onward Galilee had become an Assyrian land with predominantly pagan population. Not until the time of the Maccabees about 104 did a process of purification begin, by which the inhabitants were forced to live according to Jewish laws and ceremonies or be exiled. At this time many Jews seem to have migrated from Judaea to Galilee, among them probably the ancestors of Jesus, who indeed came from Bethlehem.[41]

The depictions of Jesus in the New Testament impute to him a variety of traits. Sometimes he appears mild and compassionate, and again brusque and harsh, but always driven by an inner fire. The Roman Church has emphasized his submissive humility because it wishes to have as many submissive followers as possible. To correct this is a problem for a German revival. To us, says Rosenberg, "Jesus appears as a *lord* who is conscious of his lordship in the highest and best sense of the term. It is his life which is significant for Germanic men, not his agonizing death, to which he owes his success among Alpine and Mediterranean peoples." We discern in the gospels the mighty preacher, the man of wrath in the Temple, the man whom all men followed, not the sacrificial lamb of Jewish prophecy, not the crucified one (604).

Scholarly textual criticism has prepared all the technical means for the formation of a fifth gospel which should clear away misinterpretations and reveal the true Jesus. Mark contains the kernel of the gospel that proclaims that we are children of God, in contrast to the Jewish doctrine of the servant of God. John's gospel expresses the eternal polarity of good and evil, in contrast to the Old Testament delusion that Jehovah made good and evil out of nothing, then declared his world very good, and then became the promoter of lies, swindles, and murders. Later, in response to criticism, Rosenberg pointed to such stories as those of Joseph in Egypt, of Jehu, and of Abraham who passed off Sarah as his sister and profited by her adulteries.[42] Mark

knows nothing of the fulfillment of Jewish Messianic ideas in Jesus, as presented by Matthew and Paul. When Peter says, "Thou art the Messiah" (Mark 8:29), Jesus rebukes him and forbids his disciples to say such things (604–605). Rosenberg's view is refuted by Mark 13 (the entire chapter), and 14:61–62, in which Jesus is clearly represented as claiming to be the Messiah.

By way of criticism we may well ask, "To whom did Jesus proclaim the gospel that we are children of God? To Nordics only? Or to the mixed population of Galilee?" Rosenberg cites no evidence that Jesus limited his doctrine to Nordics. Rosenberg despises the doctrine of the brotherhood of man as found in the churches and in Freemasonry, but the doctrine he imputes to Jesus implies it. However you whittle down the gospels, you cannot make them compatible with a doctrine of racial superiority; the fatherhood of God implies the brotherhood of man.

Paul, on the other hand, according to Rosenberg, boasted of the special favor shown by God to the Jews (Romans 3); he displayed typically Jewish presumption and intolerance in depicting his own mission (Galatians 1); and he became all things to all men in order to increase his following (I Corinthians 9). He exalted the weak, the foolish, and the base (I Corinthians 1) and promised that the Christians should judge the world (I Corinthians 6:2–3). He ascribed supreme power to Christ in this world and the next (Ephesians 1:21). Paul aspired to achieve a world revolution with the help

of the outcasts of all states and peoples, and to set up a theocracy. The combination of false humility with an urge to rule the world, a feverish yearning to march at the head of the rebels, led Paul to distort the great figure of Christ (605–606).

Rosenberg's criticism of Paul betrays his incapacity to appreciate the loftiness of Paul's spirit. It is true that Paul sought to break down the barrier between Jew and Gentile. In view of the prejudices of the time, we see that this required greatness of soul. Consider this passage from Paul's sermon in Athens:

> God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is he worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: for in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring (Acts 17:24–28).

This is a lofty expression of the doctrine of the brotherhood of man which Rosenberg rejects.

Rosenberg condemns such passages as Galatians 3:28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," because they attack racial exclusiveness, which he holds to be indispensable to

organic social life (77). But he is wrong in maintaining that Paul sought to produce a political revolution against the Roman Empire by uniting the lower classes under his leadership (74, 480, 606). The passages which he cites, I Corinthians 1, I Corinthians 6:2, 3, and Ephesians 1:21, require no such interpretation.

On the other hand, Paul clearly demands that Christians should submit to political authority. The outstanding passage on this theme is Romans 13:1–7 (Goodspeed's translation):

> Everyone must obey the authorities that are over him, for no authority can exist without the permission of God; the existing authorities have been established by him, so that anyone who resists the authorities sets himself in opposition to what God has ordained, and those who oppose him will bring down judgment upon themselves. The man who does right has nothing to fear from the magistrates, as the wrongdoer has. If you want to have no fear of the authorities, do right and they will commend you for it, for they are God's agents to do you good. . . . Pay them all that is due them—tribute to the man entitled to receive it, taxes to the man entitled to receive them, respect to the man entitled to it, and honor to the man entitled to it.[43]

This is the reverse of a revolutionary doctrine. It is a demand for political submissiveness, which was emphasized by the Lutheran tradition in contrast to the Calvinistic tendency to demand political reforms. The influence of this Pauline-Lutheran tradition helped to make the Germans submissive to the Hohenzollerns and an easy prey to the Nazis. Instead of attacking Paul,

the Nazis ought to thank him for smoothing their path in this respect, however much his creed of world-wide brotherhood discredits their tribalism.

In the circumstances in which Paul wrote there was no inconsistency between human brotherhood and political submissiveness. The ultimate political power was the Roman Empire, which was supernational in scope, and embodied to some extent an ideal of universal justice. It is the Nazis who disrupt the unity which Paul accepted.

Rosenberg considers the Christian churches to be a monstrous perversion of the simple, joyous gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven within us, of our being children of God, of service for the good, and fiery resistance to evil (607). At various times he emphasizes Jesus' words, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you" (Luke 17: 21). The Greek text may equally well mean, "The Kingdom of Heaven is *among* you," that is, the Kingdom is already partially embodied in Christ, and its visible arrival is imminent. This text by itself cannot serve as proof that the Kingdom has an exclusively inner and spiritual meaning, since other passages depict a second coming of Christ and a new order in the visible world (Mark 13; Matthew 24: 31–46; Luke 21).

Mark, we are told by Rosenberg, knows nothing of the "effeminate extravagances" of the Sermon on the Mount, such as not resisting evil and turning the other cheek. Jesus' whole life was a fiery revolt and for that he had to die. "Only men whose inner nature is bastardized can find value in a doctrine of cowardice." Such a man

is Tolstoy, who found in the Sermon on the Mount the basis for his dreary world view (607). In this connection it is amusing to note that Rosenberg's revered master, H. S. Chamberlain, cited these same passages on nonresistance and defended them as a manifestation of inner strength.[44]

Rosenberg somewhat reluctantly admits that Jesus preached a religion of love, and that all religious feeling at least resembles love, which is a medium for uniting men. But he insists that a German religious movement which is capable of developing into a folk church must unconditionally subordinate the ideal of love of one's neighbor to that of national honor. No deed can be approved by a truly German church that does not promote as its main aim the security of the folk life. Germans cannot tolerate the centuries-old view that religious ties are more binding than national ties. A German state should forbid the oath by which a Catholic bishop swears to pursue and combat heretics, apostates, and rebels against our Lord and his successor. Such an oath is to be considered an incitement to religious and class hatred, and to treasonable activity if the state fails to serve Roman interests (607–608). Thus Rosenberg tries to limit the doctrine of love so that it may not interfere with Nazi ideals. He objects to the line between orthodox and heretic, but insists on the line between German and non-German.

Rosenberg does not seem to have helped the logic of his case by the attempt to include Jesus as a Nordic hero whose message has been perverted by Paul and the

churches. He makes little positive use of Jesus in developing his doctrine. It is not clear why he retains Jesus in his system and proposes a Germanized Christianity as the basis of a future folk church, rather than a purely "German Faith" like that of Hauer or Bergmann.[45] His attitude may be a remnant of early piety, or an attempt to conciliate genuine Christians. It is more likely to be a result of his dependence on Chamberlain, who sought to purify and Germanize Christianity.[46] It is natural that many Nazis in their hostility to the Jews and to Marxian materialism should regard themselves as somehow vaguely Christian.

TEUTONISM VERSUS CATHOLICISM

For Rosenberg the first phase of Christianity is characterized by the contrast between Jesus and Paul, and its later phases are characterized by struggles between Teutonism and Catholicism. He declares that the essence of Occidental (chiefly Teutonic) religion, proclaimed by Jesus and others, is the assertion of eternal personality. Each personality is unique in eternal contrast with the rest of the universe. Each has a unique task on earth and returns to what religion symbolically calls "the Father." Because of this assertion, and in spite of all churchly additions and distortions, the life and teaching of Jesus mark a turning point in Occidental history (390–391).

Here Rosenberg introduces a Kantian turn. Since our experience of the visible world is limited by our

human forms of intuition, we cannot conceive what the life of personality beyond death may be like. The Hindu doctrine of transmigration is perhaps the most acceptable symbol for this unknowable phase of personality beyond our bourne of time and place (392).

In personality, inner law and inner freedom coincide; each of us is aware of many possible lines of conduct, yet recognizes himself in every act; this recognition implies an inner law, which each imposes on himself; but since he is the one who imposes it, he is free (392). To the Occidental, predestination and fate mean only that one's aim and one's destiny are determined by the God-in-the-breast, which is inseparable from self. The Syrian-Roman theology of Paul and the churches sunders soul and God, and makes predestination a doctrine of enslavement (395–396).

Homeric man lived with full confidence in himself and the world; but in Greek tragedy soul and fate are sundered, and the soul yields despairingly to external forces. From this despair the split soul is induced to submit to a ruling magician as vicar of God. The Church sucks out the independence of personality and tries to keep men in perpetual submissive humility (397). Germanic man, in part perverted by this influence, never wholly succumbed to it; and in Kant the inner moral law of the soul and the mechanical law of external nature coexist without mutual interference (397–398).

Honor is the supreme moral value for Nordic man. Hinduism in its decadence (147), and Christian

churches since Paul, set up love and humility as supreme values. But love does not suffice to fashion an effective human type like the Prussian officer or the medieval priest, nor to fashion an effective organization (156). The Catholic Church has been effective because of its disciplined priesthood organized to achieve power over the common people, and because of the magical system of sacraments, which plays on superstitious fear and keeps the populace in a state of submissive dependence (156). This magical system includes the doctrines of original sin, of the crucifixion as the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, of divine grace, of the Church's power to grant or refuse the grace which frees the individual from the danger of Hell or shortens his stay in Purgatory (172).

The Catholic system culminates in the sale of indulgences, the doctrine of papal infallibility, and the "corpselike obedience" demanded by St. Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order. Rosenberg quotes from St. Ignatius: "Every man who lives under obedience should be convinced that he should let himself be guided by Divine Providence *through his Superior*, as if he were a *corpse*, which lets itself be carried and laid this way and that way in every fashion." And again, "You ought to obey with a certain blind impulse, to let yourself be driven, with eager will and without investigation, to do whatever the Superior says . . ." (177).

The requirement of "corpselike obedience" has long been a bone of contention between critics and de-

fenders of the Jesuits. We must remember, in the first place, that these exhortations were not addressed to Christians in general, but to members of a religious order who had taken a vow of obedience. Defenders point out, in the second place, that the rule of obedience is not wholly unconditional, since "it is the general teaching of the Catholic Church that in no case may a man commit sin, even if he should be commanded to do so by his temporal or ecclesiastical superior." In particular, "Suarez, the great theorist of the Jesuits, expressly declares that obedience always assumes 'the lawfulness of the object.'" [47] Moreover, we read in the *Summary of the Constitutions* of the order, chapter 31, that disciples "must endeavor to be resigned interiorly . . . conforming their will and judgment wholly to the Superior's will and judgment in all things in which no sin is perceptible (*in omnibus ubi peccatum non cerneretur*)." [48]

Rosenberg believes that if the Catholic Church had succeeded in fully carrying out its program, "Europe would be a mass of characterless men ruled by fear of Purgatory and Hell, crippled by 'love' in the struggle for honor, with the better remnants engaged in benevolent 'humanitarian' activity" (159).

Rosenberg asserts that the priest is deified in the Catholic system. Berthold von Regensburg declared in the thirteenth century that the Virgin Mary and all the heavenly host would rise to their feet at the approach of a priest, and that, however great the sin a man may have committed, if he submits to the power of the

priest, the priest can instantly close Hell to him and open Heaven (226 n.). As we shall see later (p. 103 of this book), Rosenberg has garbled this quotation in a way that changes its meaning.

Such features of the Catholic system as indulgences, intercession for souls in Purgatory, the use of scapulars, holy oils, and miracle-working relics are on a level with the practices of the medicine man of a savage tribe—the medicine man "whose prayer brings rain or prevents it, whose curse kills, who has made a contract with God (or the gods) and who can coerce or at least influence him (or them) to any end by magic rituals" (172–173). After further illustrating this idea, Rosenberg concludes, "The term 'medicine man philosophy' —used without any insulting intention—therefore exactly describes the intellectual attitude of the Roman Church" (173 n.). That parenthetical phrase is the only humorous passage in the book, and the humor is unintentional.

The medicine man cannot tolerate free thought among his followers. He must encourage human anxieties and hysterical tendencies; he must preach witchcraft; he must suppress with Index, fire, and sword all investigation that tends to discredit his system—hence the imprisonment of Roger Bacon and of Galileo and the condemnation of Copernicus' work. The medicine man must try to destroy all systems that set up honor, duty, and manly fidelity as molders of life (173).

When the Germanic tribes encountered Christianity, the nature symbolism of the religion of Wotan was al-

ready declining; left to themselves, they would doubtless have developed a new religion embodying the old values of honor and freedom (155). They were tolerant of all cults (145, 156–157), and in their magnanimity they failed to detect the destructive character of the Christian Church, with its subordination of honor to love, submissiveness, and magic. Furthermore, the Church took advantage of the military superiority of southern Europe to expand its power (158). The magnanimous Teuton, well symbolized in Siegfried, assumes that his opponent shares his own sense of honor and open method of combat, and has a childlike unwillingness to be convinced of the contrary. This magnanimity has often been disastrous to Teutonic life, as in the acceptance of Catholicism and in the emancipation of the Jews in the nineteenth century (158).

To some extent Catholicism had to compromise with the Teutonic spirit. Festivals like Christmas were adopted (167). St. Martin retained the mantle, sword, and steed of Wotan; St. George and St. Michael have Nordic originals (163). The Teutonic ideals of knighthood survived with a Christian coloring (188–189). Some Catholics attempt to give the papacy credit for the knightly ideal, but this is a perversion of history (189–190).

Although Catholicism is an "Etruscan-Jewish-Roman system," it has been ennobled by the devotion of millions of Germans, and it is therefore hard for a German to condemn it (157). Nevertheless, it is alien

to the German spirit, since it has always tried to bring all men regardless of race under the domination of the Pope—with one form, one dogma, and one ritual for Nordics, Levantines, "niggers," Chinese, and Eskimos (167). Rosenberg speaks with contempt of "nigger Bishops" celebrating mass at the Eucharistic Congress of 1926 in Chicago (167–168). He claims that the blood of all races and peoples has for 2000 years been in rebellion against such a system (168).

Rosenberg interprets the so-called heretical movements of the Middle Ages as revolts of the Teutonic spirit of freedom and honor against the tyranny and uniformity of the Catholic system; such, he holds, were the movements of the Albigenses, the Waldenses, the Cathari, and Arnold of Brescia (88). "The Pope," said an earl of Foix, an Albigensian of about 1200, "has nothing to do with my religion, for the faith of every man must be free" (89). Thousands were slaughtered in the suppression of these heresies. Later the Inquisition was responsible for the death of other thousands. Rosenberg speaks of nine million victims of the Church (142, 167). But the Roman system could never wholly suppress the Teutonic love of freedom and personal honor.

Many non-Catholic readers may be averse to Torquemada and Bloody Mary, to indulgences and holy oils, the veneration of relics and the sale of St. Christopher medals, the exorcism of demons and the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius in the cathedral of Naples.[49] Such readers may take pleasure in Rosenberg's blows at

the dogmatism and the "magical" aspects of Catholicism. Observing the clash between Rosenberg's tribal mysticism and the Catholic system, such readers may feel like the pioneer woman whose husband was attacked by a bear just outside their cabin. She stood in the doorway shouting, "Go it, husband! Go it, b'ar!" Nevertheless, the pioneer woman would abandon her neutrality when she reflected that the embraces of a husband are preferable to those of a bear. Similarly a non-Catholic should abandon his neutrality when he reflects that present-day Catholicism has outgrown Torquemada and seeks to lead the faithful from crudely "magical" to more spiritual conceptions, whereas the Nazis use their tribal mysticism to hypnotize the German masses and to justify the persecution of Catholic and Protestant clergy, the liquidation of the Jews, and the depopulation of neighboring states.

MEISTER ECKHART'S MYSTICISM

Rosenberg thinks that German "blood" tended to revolt against the shackles of medieval Catholicism. He finds evidence of the revolt in Meister Eckhart, in whose mysticism he sees one of the most exalted expressions of the Nordic soul.

Eckhart lived from 1260 to 1327, his birth and death dates being close to those of Dante. He became a high official of the great preaching order of Dominicans in Germany.

Rosenberg describes Eckhart as striving to release

himself more and more fully from the entanglements of the material world. Neither pleasure and power on the one hand, nor good works on the other, are essential for the soul. The more fully the soul is detached from them, the greater its sense of its own inner freedom, power, and spiritual wealth. The soul rejects all coercion, even in its attitude toward God. In this Rosenberg finds the most profound expression of the Nordic conception of honor and freedom. This innermost citadel of the soul, the pure subject of knowing and willing, is beyond qualities, beyond all forms of space and time (217–218). From this citadel reason and will make their sorties into the world of space and time—either to overcome it, or to use it as a tool for self-realization.

Eckhart's mysticism asserts that space and time are mere appearance. The soul and God are ultimate realities transcending space, time, and matter. The soul and God are not separate and remote from each other, but are complementary aspects of one spiritual reality. Eckhart's worship is not humble, agonized, or hysterical, but proud, free, joyous, and active. For him, the rational will was the essence of the soul, as it was for Kant centuries later. Eckhart said, "In my birth all other things were born, I was at once the cause of myself and of all other things. And if I wished, neither I nor anything else would be. And if I were not, neither would God be" (225).

Eckhart constantly emphasizes nobility of soul, not sentimental feelings nor external good works. Whoever

does good works for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven, or of God, or of his salvation is on the wrong path; a real man does his works for their own sake (227). Good deeds are the spontaneous expression of the noble soul, not mere means to avoid an external Hell or gain an external Heaven. "Man should be free and lord of all his works, undisturbed and uncompelled" (231). Such a religion has no need of a sacramental system, a priestly caste, or a vicar of God. Eckhart's lofty position in the Dominican order long shielded him from attack, but at last the Archbishop of Cologne accused him of heresy. Eckhart protested to the Pope, but he died before his appeal was acted on.[50] After his death the Pope condemned some of his views.

Rosenberg hails Eckhart as the greatest apostle of the Nordic Occident, who "gave us our religion," and spent his life in the effort to overcome Syrian dogma and "to awaken the God in our own bosom, the Kingdom of Heaven within us" (218–219). The German mysticism of which he was the virile leader petered out in the effeminate sentimentalism of Angelus Silesius and others (232 n., 256–257). Only after six hundred years does the German soul begin to understand Eckhart (220).

Luther's great deed was the rejection of the priesthood, his denial of the claim of a caste of men to stand between other men and God. This involved the rejection of the magic sacramental system of Syrian-Etruscan origin and of African monasticism with its antinatural mortification of the flesh. Luther's deed was the greatest

spiritual revolution since the rise of Christianity (183–184). He shook off some of the anti-Nordic shackles from the German spirit. But he failed to rise to the level of Eckhart's mysticism. In his dogmatic adherence to the letter of the Bible, including the Jewish Old Testament as well as the partly Jewish New Testament, he perpetuated an alien element which has hampered German spiritual development (129, 218).

Christianity spread the idea of boundless love and of the equality of all men before God (169). This was taken over by Freemasonry in the eighteenth century. In 1740 the Masons coined the slogan of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." They set up an ideal of universal human brotherhood, including Jews and Turks on the same footing with Christians (201). This breaks down the racial basis for national units and makes the individual supreme. From this source come political democracy and economic *laissez faire*. "The naked wealth of the individual becomes the highest good of democracy" (202). Rosenberg blames this doctrine of "humanity" for the democratic revolutions of the last 150 years, for the emancipation of the Jews (a great calamity in his opinion), for international finance, for uncensored pornography, and for the profusion of luxurious institutions for the sick and the insane (202–203). He condemns it as paving the way for Marxism (203). Rosenberg himself is not inclined to avarice or pornography, but the Nazis who have gobbled up the banks and industries of conquered countries have surpassed all rivals in avarice, and Julius Streicher's anti-

Jewish journal, *Der Stuermer*, has surpassed all rivals in pornography.

In the twentieth century, Rosenberg asserts, there is need for a greater reformation than Luther's. Suggestions for it are furnished by the mysticism of Eckhart. The values of personal, family, national, and racial honor must be its core. Dogma must be eliminated. There must be no infallible Bible, no infallible Pope. Nordic man must become conscious of his racial soul. His God will be no remote Jehovah but the God in his own bosom. He will rejoice in the eternity of personality which Jesus proclaimed. Miracle, magic, and priestcraft must be rejected as well as antinatural asceticism. Only some future religious genius can create the imaginative expression and live the exemplary life which will bring about such a reformation and establish a vitally effective folk religion (599–624, 698–701).[51]

V

PHILOSOPHY

ROSENBERG A PHILOSOPHER?

ROSENBERG must be regarded as the chief philosopher of the Nazis. But is he really a philosopher? If philosophy consists in sweeping generalizations about the course of history, in discussions of famous thinkers, in judgments on philosophical issues, and in pronouncements regarding supreme values, the answer is *yes*. But if philosophy requires impartial and judicious weighing of evidence, cogency of argument, caution in drawing conclusions, breadth and depth of human sympathy, the answer is *no*.

ROSENBERG'S FAVORITE THINKERS

The philosophers for whom Rosenberg shows the most respect are the early Hindu mystics, Meister Eckhart, Leibniz, Kant, and Schopenhauer. It would seem that mysticism, by rising above space and time, must surely rise above differences of skin color and cephalic indices. But Rosenberg links mysticism and race. In his opinion it was the Hindu *aristocrat* (that is, the Aryan conqueror of darker natives) whose breath ex-

panded to coincide with the spirit of the universe, and race mixture caused Hindu mysticism to degenerate (28–31).

In Eckhart's mystic doctrine the soul, by detaching itself from the world, enhances its sense of its own inner freedom, power, and spiritual wealth. It rejects all coercion, even in its attitude toward God. Its worship is proud, joyous, and active. In all this Rosenberg finds the profoundest expression of the distinctively Germanic soul (217–218, 223–231). He gives us no critical evaluation of mystic claims to reveal truth and achieve value; rather he uncritically endorses the claims and arbitrarily excludes non-Aryans from participation in them. He does not even mention Plotinus, the greatest mystic of Greco-Roman antiquity, whose thought exercised an immense influence on medieval theology and Renaissance humanism. His discussion of Meister Eckhart is a most fascinating presentation of mysticism, yet it is perversely and fatally one-sided.

Turning to Meister Eckhart himself, we find that he said, "To understand my preaching, five things are needed. The hearer must have passed beyond strife; he must be contemplating his highest good; he must be satisfied to do God's bidding; he must be a beginner among beginners; and denying himself, he must be so a master of himself as to be incapable of anger." [52] Rosenberg is far from fulfilling these requirements of serenity, humility, and benevolence.

Consider these statements by Eckhart:

God, the Word made flesh in Christ, assumed the human nature common to all men. . . . Whence, whatever he bestowed on *him*, he has given to all men with him.[53]

As long as you love another person less than yourself, you will not really succeed in loving yourself but if you love all alike, including yourself, you will love them as one person and that person is both God and man.[54]

In the light of these statements, how can Rosenberg say that Eckhart's doctrine of soul is meant for "bearers of the same or related blood" (258)? Do not these passages express a spirit which is neither anti-Jewish nor filled with Teutonic megalomania, but unreservedly cosmopolitan?

Again Eckhart says:

. . . Charity loves all in one and one God in all. Admittedly it is the punishment of hell to be separated from God, as to see God in his essence, to have him, to be united with him is the essential prize. Moreover, charity is for all that has ever been created, and would not dismiss God even for a moment, even as it would not dismiss him eternally.[55]

If I rightly interpret these dark sayings, to hate any man is to dismiss God, and Rosenberg (according to Eckhart) is already in hell.

Rosenberg mentions Kant frequently but briefly. He praises him unreservedly for establishing the reign of natural law in the phenomenal world of space and time, and the reign of rational law in the moral world. These doctrines exclude the miracles of the Catholic

sacraments. They also exclude unconditional obedience to the will of an arbitrary God or an earthly religious superior. They give explicit expression to a world view which is always implicit in the Germanic soul (121, 131, 397–398). But Rosenberg disregards the trend toward political liberty and world peace which inheres in Kant's doctrines. Kant's doctrines are full of the individualism and universalism which Rosenberg elsewhere condemns as poisonous to folkish national spirit (167–169, 200–204, 267–268, 320–321, 387, 695). He does indeed rebuke Kant for the universalistic character of his aesthetics (303), but he ignores Kant's political views.

Leibniz is praised for his emphasis upon the individual personality which must work out organically its own unique capacities; this suggests an ethic, not of universal form or external goals, but of self-realization (689–690). Leibniz' personal monads were "windowless" toward one another, but Herder corrected this by stressing the community of national consciousness and attributing to each national community a unique value independent of universal laws or general progress (690–694).

Schopenhauer receives more extensive treatment (323–344). Rosenberg admires many aspects of Schopenhauer's thought but accuses him of ambiguity and perversity in the interpretation of his fundamental concept, the will. Rosenberg insists that the normal meaning of "will" is the free spirit that shows itself in the German mystics, in Luther, in the Nazarene who over-

comes the world (332). Schopenhauer rightly, according to Rosenberg, regards this will as unfathomable and transcending all phenomena, but wrongly depicts it as perpetually shifting from desire to desire without any fixed direction (332).

For this reason the relation of will and intellect becomes obscure and unintelligible. If intellect is a by-product of will, serving as its tool, how does it come about that in some men intellect liberates itself from the will to live and becomes purely contemplative in aesthetic appreciation, or artistically creative, or saintly (393)? Schopenhauer's term "will" ambiguously covers both will and impulse (335). It is not will but, at most, impulse, which we share with animals, plants, and inorganic nature. When he spoke of the denial of the will, he should have said "denial of impulse and affirmation of will." (337). Thus the apparent unity of Schopenhauer's system is shown to rest on an ambiguity.

Rosenberg mentions other philosophers, but the preceding paragraphs suffice to show how he selects what he requires from each.

THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Rosenberg has a theory of knowledge which emerges toward the end of the *Mythus*, and which casts some light on his apparently illogical methods of historical and philosophical interpretation. Like many intellectuals of recent decades, he is *anti-intellectual*. He quotes with approval Goethe's maxim, "Only what is fruitful

is true" (685). He develops this into a sort of pragmatism. But his standard of fruitfulness is not found in the life of James's groping but amiable individual, nor in Dewey's perpetual social readjustment, nor in Schopenhauer's will to live, nor in Nietzsche's will to power. It is found in the life of the folk, in the vital and cultural expression of the eternal Nordic soul.

Rosenberg here misinterprets Goethe's phrase, which occurs in the poem "*Vermächtnis*," published in 1829. Light is thrown on Goethe's meaning by a letter which he wrote to Zelter in the same year. In it he says,

> I have noticed that I regard that idea as true which is fruitful for me, fits in with the rest of my thought, and at the same time helps me forward; now it is not only possible but natural that such a thought may not fit in with another man's opinions, may not help him forward but instead hinder him, and so he will regard it as false. If one is thoroughly convinced of this he will refrain from all controversy.[56]

As the poem shows, Goethe regards even our best thoughts as never completely grasping the eternal truths but always having some share in them. He expresses a tentative, progressive, generous, and conciliatory mode of thinking, which has nothing in common with Nazi dogmas and hates. We see here how Rosenberg seeks to give prestige to his ideas by misinterpreting the words of revered authors.

Rosenberg rejects the Hellenic search for absolute, all-inclusive truth, which still dominates philosophy (681-682). An organic living creature possesses "form"

(*Gestalt*); its inner and outer structure is adapted to purpose; and its mental and spiritual life pursues goals. These purposes and goals inherent in organic life are the test of "organic truth." Different aspects of organic truth are the products of understanding and reason in cognition; of intuition in art, legend, and religious myth; of will in moral and religious systems. All of these "stand in the service of organic truth, i.e., in the service of the life of the people grounded in race." Their criterion is, do they enhance the form and inner values of this life, develop it more purposively, fashion it with greater vital power (683–684)?

He considers it utterly perverse to seek through mere cognition an absolute and eternal truth identical for all mankind, because truth is relative to the organic life of the essentially unchangeable race. "The ultimate insight possible to a race is already implicit in its first religious myth" (*ibid.*). The view of honor in life and fate in nature which is expressed in the old German legends revived by Wagner must be the core of any future German philosophy and religion (697–701).

A race does not live by logic but by developing a "mystic synthesis" (117); any philosophy that goes beyond mere formal theory of knowledge is a confession (*Bekenntnis*) rather than a cognition (*Erkenntnis*); it reveals and acknowledges the character values of soul and race (118).

Since this theory of knowledge and truth is anti-intellectual, we are not surprised to find it vague. The character values of soul and race do not lend themselves

to clear analysis but are a theme for dogmatism and propaganda.

Such a theory helps to explain Rosenberg's adherence to historical views which he admits are incapable of scientific proof, such as the non-Jewish origin of Jesus. Presumably the Nordic soul in Rosenberg recognizes intuitively that Jesus is a kindred spirit and that it is beneficial to German cultural development to regard Jesus as a Nordic. The presence of Nordic elements in Galilee at some time or other is all the objective evidence he wants.

Rosenberg's notion of truth also helps to explain his attitude toward criticism. He insists that his essential message would not be discredited "even if the entire *historical* proof were to be refuted at every point." [57] This implies that the essential truth for Germans is what the German soul intuits as congenial and advantageous to itself, when the mists and miasmas of Jewish and Catholic thought are blown away. The intellectualist critic who demands facts, consistency, and cogency is ruled out from the start. To him the answer would be, "We think with our blood."

The race doctrine itself is presumably immune to criticism. Good Germans discern as Germans that it is good for Germans to believe in German superiority; Germans who doubt it are traitors to their race, perverted by alien influences such as Judaism, Catholicism, and Freemasonry. Non-Germans must acquiesce or take the consequences.

If it is true that Hitler declares himself well aware of

the scientific objections to the race doctrine but proposes to use it anyway, and that Goering keeps a half-Jew (General Milch) in a high post and declares himself the sole judge of the Aryanism of his staff, they are quite within the bounds of Rosenbergian epistemology.[58]

RACE

When we turn to the more positive and constructive aspects of Rosenberg's thought, we find them dominated by the concepts of race and of honor. It is appropriate that the chief collection of his essays and speeches should be entitled *Blut und Ehre* ("Blood and Honor"). The concept of race dominates his historical discussions, as we have already seen. It dominates his theories of politics and law; it dominates his metaphysics and his aesthetics. The concept of honor dominates his interpretation of ethics and religion. The two concepts are linked, since the Aryan race is characterized by its attachment to the supreme value of *honor*. His whole system stands or falls according to the validity of these two concepts. Yet his notion of race, never clearly defined, rests on pseudogenetics and pseudo-anthropology, and his notion of honor is, in my opinion, a question-begging one.

The fallacies of the Nazi race doctrine have already been touched on in this book (pp. 14 ff.). They have been ably and amply exposed in a number of volumes including works by Ruth Benedict, Frank H. Hankins,

Jacques Barzun, Julian Huxley, A. C. Haddon, and M. F. Ashley Montagu.[59]

In the *Mythus* there is no mention of the Mendelian laws of heredity or the modern science of genetics developed from them. There is only casual mention of skin color, hair, cephalic indices, and other anthropological data. The treatment of such topics is merely impressionistic. Race for Rosenberg is the external expression of a collective soul (2, 116, 529). His Aryan race is externally blond, blue-eyed, tall, and longheaded. On the inner or soul side it is characterized by a sense of honor, courage, love of freedom, capacity to build states, mysticism, an interest in personality and history, a recognition of inner and outer law, a rejection of miracles, and a spirit of exploration, invention, and scientific research (120, 138, 141–143, 152–158, 168, 268–270, 389). However, the inner soul and outward physical traits do not always correspond. Rosenberg thinks that it would be superficial to judge individuals by their cephalic indices; conduct and achievement are a better criterion (596). That many of the Nazi leaders do not conform to the "Nordic" type has always been obvious. This fact gave rise to the joke that the true Nordic is "as blond as Hitler, as tall as Goebbels, as slender as Goering, and as virile as Roehm." Nevertheless Rosenberg asserts that those whose services to the state will entitle them to membership in a future German nobility will "inevitably" approximate the Nordic physical type in about 80 per cent of the individual cases (596). Thus he lets

the boundaries of the Nordic race become elastic but continues to glorify the Nordic type.

Race mixture is blamed for the decay of the great civilizations of the past, and the term "bastard" is freely applied to mixed races. He admits, however, that no European people is racially homogeneous. The mixture of Nordic and other European races may even have been advantageous so long as it did not occur on too great a scale. The Mediterranean race with its cooler and more formal self-control, the Dinaric race with its vigorous temperament, the Alpine race with its passive, tenacious power of resistance may contribute something of value to the Nordic. The Nordic element has given cultural form to Dinaric and Baltic races. "Even a predominantly Dinaric type often owes its inner form to the Nordic." But the Levantine elements in the Dinaric race may lead to mongrelism, and the excessive Alpine element in parts of France, Germany, and Switzerland tends to produce such evils as democracy, intellectual stagnation, and cowardly pacifism. Rosenberg, attributing the great achievements of the past to the Nordics, sees no hope for the future without promoting their biological multiplication and their cultural dominance (85–86, 576, 640).

Although the racial and national prejudices expressed by Rosenberg have been shared by many German writers, they have been rejected by some of the greatest. Lessing, Kant, Schiller, and Goethe were intensely German in character, but they upheld a lofty cosmopolitan

ideal. Eckermann in 1830 called Goethe's attention to the reproach that he had written no war poems at the time of the German uprising against Napoleon, when Goethe was already past sixty. Goethe discussed the matter at some length. Eckermann quoted him as saying:

> How could I write poems of hate when I felt no hate? And, between you and me, I did not hate the French, though I thanked God when we got rid of them. How could I, for whom only culture and barbarism are matters of importance, hate a nation which is one of the most cultivated in the world and to which I owe so great a part of my own culture? Anyhow, national hatred is a peculiar thing. At the lowest levels of culture you will find it strongest and fiercest. But there is a level at which it entirely disappears, and one stands to some extent *above* the nations, and feels a bit of good fortune or a misfortune of a neighboring people as if it had happened to one's own people. This cultural level was suited to my nature, and I had firmly established myself in it long before I reached my sixtieth year.[60]

Evidently Goethe would have found Rosenberg's book barbarous.

HONOR AND RELATED VALUES

Let us now consider Rosenberg's contention that the sense of honor and love of freedom are distinctive traits of the Nordic soul, the psychological aspect of the biological type.

Honor, which Rosenberg sets up as the central con-

cept in ethics and religion, is not a clear and simple idea but a complex and ambiguous one. Honor is respect felt or shown by one person to another. Or it is favorable reputation—the respect received by a man from a social group. Or it is a man's concern to maintain those standards of conduct which command the respect of his group. In its most exalted meaning, honor consists in setting the highest standards for one's own conduct and scrupulously living up to them, regardless of the praise or blame of any group.

In all these meanings of honor some scale of values is taken for granted. What character or behavior must one have to obtain respect from others or from himself? What are these highest standards which one must set up and adhere to? To answer that they are those which a man of honor intuitively recognizes would be to argue in a circle. Historically, the codes of honor are strict in each group, but notoriously variable from group to group. Thus the concept of honor does not answer the questions, What is good? What is right? but presupposes an answer to them.

To say that the Aryan or Nordic race excels in its sense of honor can only mean that its members are especially concerned with their reputation, or especially concerned to deserve the reputation they cherish, or especially concerned to set up and maintain high standards for themselves. Each race excels according to its own standards, and Rosenberg does not show us any neutral point of view from which a fair comparison may be made.

Rosenberg seems to include courage and veracity in the concept of honor. In these respects it is hard to see that the Germans excel others. Rosenberg regards France as largely drained of its Nordic elements by the wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by the Huguenot emigration, and by the revolutionary guillotine (not to mention the influx of African blood which he takes so seriously). Yet what has the German army ever done to surpass the courage of the defenders of Verdun?

As regards veracity and adherence to agreements, Germans once had a high reputation. But the Nazis have done all that is possible to destroy that reputation. Instead of veracity we see Goebbels' propaganda. Instead of adherence to agreements we see the long string of solemn pledges, each brazenly broken at the convenient moment, which Hitler made to Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Russia.[61] All this is quite in line with utterances about making and breaking treaties which Rauschning attributes to Hitler:

> Why should not one please others and facilitate matters for oneself by signing pacts if others believe that something is thereby accomplished or regulated? I shall make any treaty I require. . . . It will never prevent me from doing at any time what I regard as necessary for Germany's interests. . . . Perhaps I shall not be able to avoid an alliance with Russia. I shall keep that as a trump card. . . . But it will never stop me from as firmly retracing my steps, and attacking Russia when my aims in the West have been achieved.[62]

Freedom is another value which Rosenberg associates with Nordic honor. It was honor and freedom which drove the Northmen to seek "lands where there was room for lords," and inspired them to fight to the last man in their castles when their independence was threatened (153). But Rosenberg's idea of freedom is the reverse of democratic. Man is free in proportion as he is true to his inmost nature. His inmost nature is membership in a race, and the eternal values of his race express themselves, during certain periods, in well-marked objective types, such as, for instance, the Prussian officer (528–531). Not economic individualism nor cultural and moral anarchy constitutes freedom, but the full expression of the racial soul in a cohesive social order which brings forth human types finding their highest satisfaction in serving the organic life of the folk (532–534).

Germanic freedom is declared to be incompatible with the corpselike obedience of the Jesuits, an obedience which Rosenberg regards as destructive of both freedom and honor (175–180). How then was German freedom compatible with the autocracy of the *Fuehrer* and with the idolatry of him which was diligently cultivated? Membership in the Jesuit order is optional, but the subjects of the *Fuehrer* had no choice. Rosenberg rages against the dogma of papal infallibility (181–183), but he never protested against the claims of political and military infallibility for the *Fuehrer.*

Both *Mein Kampf* and the *Mythus* appeared before the Nazis came into power. It is perhaps significant

that Hitler's book praises the organization of the Catholic Church and proposes unlimited power for the Leader of the party and the state. Rosenberg, on the other hand, would place reliance upon a *Deutscher Orden*—a nonhereditary aristocracy of sword and plow, consisting of men who have distinguished themselves by outstanding service to the folkish state (520, 546). This, he thinks, would give fuller expression to the soul of the people than a hereditary monarchy and avoid the dangers of demagogy and plutocracy which inhere in democracy. However, he is utterly vague as to the powers and mode of operation of this Order.

Duty and loyalty are other values associated with honor. The phrase *deutsche Treue* expresses the popular conviction that loyalty is a basic and distinctive German virtue. It appears in the fidelity of the ancient Teutonic vassal to his chosen lord. It appears in Frederick the Great's devotion to Prussia. "How can a prince outlive his state, the glory of his people, and his own honor?" "No one will be able to say of me that I outlived the freedom of my Fatherland and the greatness of my House." "They ought to know that it is not necessary for me to live, but it is necessary for me to do my duty." These are some of the passages from Frederick's letters which Rosenberg quotes with ardent approval (199).

Kant is "the loftiest teacher of the idea of duty" (630), but Rosenberg does not elaborate on this point. Perhaps he could not do so without bringing to light

Kant's insistence upon respect for personality *in all men*—a doctrine fatal to Rosenberg's racialism.

What is to be done if loyalty and honor conflict? If, for instance, your lord demands that you do an act contrary to your sense of honor? This is a question which must have presented itself to many Germans since 1933. Rosenberg's answer seems to be clearly implied in his praise of Hagen who "throws *his* honor away in service of the honor of his *king*" (188). In the Japanese system of *Bushido* the answer is more austere. The vassal cannot evade his duty to his lord, nor can he commit an act which he considers dishonorable; he must, therefore, either dissuade his lord from insisting on the command, or submit to punishment for disobedience, or commit suicide.[63]

Ideals of honor and freedom are not peculiar to Nordics. Greeks, Romans, Frenchmen, Italians, Englishmen, Spaniards, and Japanese have had lofty ideals of honor or freedom or both. It is true that special conceptions of honor and freedom have been developed by Prussian militarism, German romanticism, and Nazism. To the Nazis their own conception seems the only valid one; hence they consider themselves the sole champions of honor and freedom. To them it seems that German "honor" requires breaking agreements as soon as they hamper the expansion of the German *Volk*. To them it seems that Christianity and democracy are hostile to "freedom." But to Christians and democrats, to Latins and Britons and Americans, such an

interpretation seems absurd and wicked. The cleavage is not between races, for there are Nordics and Alpines on both sides, but between religious, moral, and political traditions.

This contrast of traditional ideals may be studied in *Social Philosophies in Conflict* by J. A. Leighton, *The Roots of National Socialism* by R. D'O. Butler, *Force or Reason?* and *World Order in Historical Perspective* by H. Kohn, *The Clash of Political Ideals* by Albert R. Chandler, and *Fountainheads of Freedom* by I. Edman. A valuable popular presentation is *Our Side Is Right* by R. B. Perry.

RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS

Rosenberg's discussions of God are baffling, but we must see what we can make of them. Some things at least are clear. He rejects a God who made the world out of nothing, and who intervenes in its course to perform miracles. He insists that the Germanic soul recognizes a reign of law in the world of phenomena (597–598). He rejects a God whose commands are arbitrary, who demands humility, who delegates to priests a power of giving or withholding salvation (598). The inner spiritual world is also a realm of law. Rosenberg gives general approval to Kant's doctrines of natural and moral law, but he does not quote Kant's formulations of the moral law—doubtless because they are clearly universal and rational in character, not tribal and mystical.

Rosenberg extols the mystic approach to God, but

the only mystics he especially praises are the early Hindus and Meister Eckhart. Perhaps the most definite statement on God is one which he makes in connection with Eckhart's mysticism. It evidently expresses his own view, but its application to Eckhart is questionable.

> This effort of the mystic requires therefore the exclusion of the empirical world, in order that, by becoming so far as possible a pure subject, we may become aware of the metaphysical essence that dwells in us; and as that is not *completely* possible, the idea 'God' is created as a new object of this soul, in order ultimately to proclaim the equivalence of soul and God (222).

From his race doctrine it appears that the indwelling metaphysical essence is that of the race—soul and race are correlative (2, 116, 529). "The God we revere would not be, if our soul and our blood were not," is almost the final word of the book (701).

"The God in the bosom" is the only God that Rosenberg adores. Or does he adore? I find no evidence of personal religious feeling in the *Mythus*. The emotions chiefly displayed are hatred and contempt for Jews, hostility and contempt toward Catholicism, pride of race, and zeal for the reform, rejuvenation, and aggrandizement of Germany. Rosenberg seems to *recommend* a mystic religion as appropriate to the enhancement and expansion of Germanism, rather than to feel and rejoice in such a religion himself.[64]

On the subject of immortality he seems to vacillate. He tells us that the Occident, in agreement with Jesus,

asserts "eternal personality in contrast to the whole world" (390).

> In its individual embodiment (manifestation) it comes from an unknown, which in many an hour of inward exaltation emerges like the shadow of a memory; here on earth it has an unknown task to perform. . . . Each personality is a unit without end. . . . The monad stands alone in the universe, it returns home to what, in religious language, it calls "the Father" (390–391).

So far he seems to assert individual immortality.

A little further on we read, "The dignity of personality has nothing to do with the person [he means the visible individual], otherwise worldly people would have the strongest belief in immortality. But they merely demand the prolongation of their animal life to infinity" (391). This hints that perhaps only some collective soul is immortal. The Egyptians are cited as an instance of the "worldly people" to whom he refers. He finds in the Hindu doctrines of karma and transmigration the best *symbol* for a truth which we cannot directly conceive, since our *thought* is limited by space, time, and causality (392). The idea of immortality is a product of religious imagination, yet the strictest theory of knowledge cannot contradict it (394). He deals with the startling thought of a perpetually increasing number of souls in the beyond (392) by pointing out, in Kantian fashion, that we must not try to apply empirical principles to anything beyond the empirical world. If he had turned to Leibniz he would have found a man who did not fear big num-

bers, but declared that all individual souls have existed since the creation of the world and will persist forever.[65] So far as the formation of the future folkish church is concerned, only a lofty sense of values will count, and no acceptance of dogmas regarding grace and love, immortality or mortality will be a requirement (611). In these passages he seems more or less agnostic about individual immortality.

Elsewhere we hear that the individual man is nothing by himself, and has personality only as a link in a chain of thousands of generations (634). The Germanic spirit instinctively feels that personality is eternal and cannot be lost. Other races, less conscious of personality, have merely recorded data about persons (270). Nordic man uses archaeology and history to reveal to himself other unique forms and values of personality, as when Herder gathered the "voices of the peoples"; but in the face of all this the Nordic man feels himself to be *alone* (270–271). This mood accounts for the emphasis upon the fragmentary, deserted, and remote in Nordic art. Rosenberg cites Don Quixote, Hamlet, Parsifal, Faust, Rembrandt, Beethoven, Goethe, Wagner, and Nietzsche (271). Does he mean that the individual feels his loneliness in contrast even to his own race, or that the individual feels the uniqueness of his race as loneliness? He goes on to say that activity is for the Occidental the expression of an inner essence not motivated by any earthly aim, whereas the Jew is busy in the pursuit of earthly gains (271). All this seems to hint that the uniqueness of the *race* is

the essence of personality, and that it would be senseless to expect to retain one's individuality in the "other" world. Thus we find passages pointing toward individual immortality, toward agnosticism about immortality, and toward a collective racial immortality.[66] This doctrine of immortality is so vague and ambiguous that it is difficult to criticize it more specifically. It fits in with Rosenberg's aversion to Marxian materialism and helps to create an atmosphere of mystery and edification. In general, the function of theology and religion in the Rosenbergian system is to throw a halo around Nazism.

Disregarding Rosenberg for the moment, let us remind ourselves that the great religions are channels through which human aspirations have flowed. Man aspires to harmony, integrity, "holiness" within himself, to harmony with his fellow men, to harmony with outer nature. Such aspirations have found expression and support in Taoism, in Buddhism, in Stoicism, in Catholic and Protestant Christianity. These movements differ in their metaphysics, in their poetic and artistic expression, in their rituals, and in their institutional forms. While differences in their ethical aims may be noted, they all stress the world-wide kinship of mankind. They cross national and racial barriers. They welcome as converts all men who are willing to accept their values.

The initiators of these great movements abjured force in spreading their doctrines, relying on persuasion and example. It was not Christianity but a perversion of Christianity that motivated crusades against the

heathen and the bloody persecution of heretics. Powerful forces within the Church have helped to overcome this perversion.

In harsh contrast to these religions of universal fellowship, the tribal mysticism of the Nazis seeks converts only within racial boundaries. Beyond these boundaries it seeks only dupes like Mussolini, sycophants like Quisling and Laval, and slaves like the unfortunate Frenchmen and Poles condemned to toil for the master race in field and factory. Rosenberg accuses the Catholic Church of exploiting the hysterical fears and illusions of the ignorant masses. But Nazi leaders, including Rosenberg, propagate illusion, fear, and hate through their anti-Semitism and exaggerated anti-Communism; they exploit the resulting hysteria to aggrandize their own movement. After comparing Nazi "religion" and Christianity, who can doubt which degrades humanity and which exalts it?

THE ARTS

Rosenberg shows much interest in the arts, as his architectural training might lead us to expect. About one-fourth of the seven hundred pages in the *Mythus* are devoted to "The Nature of Germanic Art." This section contains extensive digressions, but these are balanced by frequent references to the arts in other sections of the volume.

Here, as elsewhere, race is the basic concept. He rejects all efforts toward a universal aesthetic doctrine

valid for all men (278–279), even in the forms given to it by Kant and Schopenhauer (319–344, 421–422), who are among his intellectual heroes. Kant and Schiller, Schopenhauer and Goethe fixed their eyes on the arts of Greece and assumed that they could serve as a basis for a *universal* aesthetics. But their practice belied their theory. Goethe praised the formal merits of the "Laocoön," but in creating his *Faust* his Germanic instinct triumphed over his theoretical adherence to Hellenism (278). This statement grossly oversimplifies Goethe's relation to Greek and Germanic influences. He wrote not only *Faust*, Part I, which might be called Germanic, but *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, *Tasso*, and the "Helena" section of *Faust*, Part II, which follow Greek models.

Rosenberg rejects both individualism and universalism in all fields, because both are hostile to the racial, national unit, the *Volk*. Individualism and universalism he characterizes as straight lines running off to infinity; race and *Volk* are the source and support of individual life and prescribe organic limits within which the individual may fruitfully develop his creative powers (320–321). Art is not to be understood by analyzing the perceptions and pleasures of the spectator, as has been attempted by philosophers and psychologists in the last hundred years (414 ff.). The production of art is an effort of the will to unburden itself, to manifest the racial personality (316–318). In listening properly to music, the hearer perceives a will-to-form, an organization of forms. The formative forces latent in the

hearer, resembling those of the composer, are brought into play and find fulfillment. The artist works from within outward, the recipient or listener works from without inward, in order to achieve the experience which filled the artist's mind in the process of creation (417–418). In viewing a Gothic cathedral one experiences something vast that overwhelms his individuality, yet enhances his sense of the sublimity of personality. The cathedral is an *action*, a human creation of stupendous vigor. What extorts one's reverence is ultimately the sense of unity with the racial personality, the form-creating power, manifested in the cathedral (421–422).

The racial soul reveals itself in the type of beauty which art glorifies. Most aestheticians, Rosenberg complains, have disregarded the existence of a racial ideal of physical beauty and a supreme spiritual value determined by race (279).

Greek sculpture and vase painting depict a Nordic type of beauty in heroes, athletes, and Olympian gods, contrasted with an inferior racial type in their sileni, satyrs, etc. (281). The latter are depicted with round heads, swollen foreheads, snub noses, and thick lips. This negroid-oriental type must be that of the conquered local race or of imported slaves (281–282).

Socrates, whose search for a universal good not bounded by local conventions helped to disintegrate Hellenic life, is depicted as belonging to the inferior type (284). Rosenberg disregards the fact that as soon as realistic portraits begin to appear, at the time of Alex-

ander the Great, we do not find among them the conventional heroic type with the straight nose continuing the straight line of the forehead. It is doubtful whether that ideal type ever had much to do with reality. Pittard, in *Race and History*, says bluntly, ". . . The nasofrontal type which the sculptors represented does not exist as a normal morphological character; it is an aesthetic creation." [67] If it represented a once dominant group, how does it happen that such a group left no trace among the leading citizens of later centuries who were portrayed in sculpture?

In all European art, Rosenberg claims, the *hero* is depicted with a high forehead, clear blue or gray eyes, and vigorous, though not excessive, muscular development. One cannot imagine a hero of the Alpine type with a stocky, broad-shouldered figure, bowlegs, a thick neck, and a sloping forehead. The Nordic type is found in the statues of the old Germanic kings and emperors, in the "St. George" and the "Gattamelata" of Donatello, and the "Colleoni" of Verrocchio. Deity itself, whether in the person of the Father or the Son, is depicted by means of a Nordic type, as in the "Creation of Adam" by Michelangelo and the "Resurrection" by Grünewald. There is nothing Jewish in the traditional depictions of Jesus. "Even the great artists of the South cannot comprehend a hook-nosed, flat-footed Savior" (290–295, 616–617). Presumably Rosenberg would have a fit if he were to see one of Epstein's portrayals of Christ.[68] How little Grünewald cared for racial types is shown in the Isenheim Altar, where Christ is depicted

with very dark hair in the "Crucifixion" and "Lamentation," and very light hair in the "Resurrection."

Rosenberg lays stress on the blond beauties in paintings by Giorgione and Titian, and the blond tresses mentioned by Dante in his twelfth *Canzone*, as showing the dominance of the Nordic ideal in Italian culture. When Velasquez wished a foil for a blond, curly-haired princess he introduced a dwarf; that is, one of those bastard racial types which abound in Spain. From Velasquez to Zuloaga these poor, cross-eyed cripples have been used to express a stupid, earth-bound mentality (290). Cervantes' Don Quixote is a tragic distortion of Nordic chivalry, morbidly exaggerated under an alien sun; his Sancho Panza is no ordinary fat man, but the racial type of the Oriental, dark-skinned man —superstitious, materialistic, incapable of culture or a soaring spirit (290). Thus Sancho Panza and the dwarfs correspond to the sileni of Greek art (291). The reader should be reminded that the faces of Michelangelo and Beethoven resembled this "inferior" type, yet Rosenberg exalts them as "Germanic artists."

Rosenberg maintains that both Greek and Germanic types of beauty have a Nordic racial basis, but that the former is external and static, the latter internal and dynamic. He illustrates this by the heads of Pericles and Frederick the Great (293), ignoring the fact that the familiar busts of Pericles are almost devoid of individuality and wholly devoid of realism.[69] He compares the static, sculpturesque quality of the *Iliad* and the tragedies of Sophocles with the more stirring ex-

pression of life in the *Nibelungenlied* and Shakespeare's plays (306–307). Such figures as Richard III and Iago are effective because of the vital force they display, without our raising moral issues (306).

A similar contrast is drawn between the Doric temple and the Gothic cathedral. The former is the most perfect, self-contained organization of three-dimensional space. The interrelation of burden and support is displayed in the clearest fashion, and no line or ornament points beyond the temple form itself (353). The latter expresses in spatial form a "metaphysical feeling of time"; everything is here organized to express upward rhythmic movement; it is the earliest embodiment in stone of the dynamic Occidental soul (352, 354–357). How would Rosenberg interpret the massive Norman and Romanesque architecture of Caen, Worms, and Durham, which he should have known as an architectural student? Surely that is "Nordic" if anything is.

The Gothic style arose in northern France, before its population had lost its Teutonic elements through the emigration of the Huguenots and the bloody work of the guillotine. The cathedrals of Paris, Rheims, Amiens, and Rouen were great achievements. But the Gothic idea gained still fuller expression in Germany, through greater freedom in the ground plan and the arrangement of towers, and further stress on vertical movement and on the suppression of horizontal lines (357–358). In spite of what Rosenberg says, it would be hard to find German examples which showed more

stress on unrestrained upward movement than the Sainte Chapelle in Paris, the cathedral of Beauvais, and the churches of St. Ouen and St. Maclou at Rouen.

Rosenberg cannot praise Christian art in general because of his hostility to the creed, ritual, and organization of the Church. He asserts that the mystic religious fervor of the Germanic elements in Europe could find no suitable outlet in such an institution, but that this fervor gradually found ways to express itself in art. It inspired such masterpieces as the Gothic cathedrals, Grünewald's "Crucifixion," the self-portraits of Rembrandt, the fugues of Bach, and Beethoven's "Eroica" Symphony (443).

The genuine Germanic artist has a concentrated *will* to master a great vision and reorganize it in a new creation that releases the tension of his spirit and brings it in harmony with the collective will of the race (426). He cites the struggles for self-expression of Beethoven, Berlioz, and Wagner, Leonardo and Rembrandt, Hölderlin, Flaubert, and Nietzsche—all of whom he claims as Germanic artists (316–318, 422–425, 433).

So much for the noble art of the noble Nordic. At the opposite pole are the artistic efforts of the Jews. Rosenberg's contempt for the Psalms and for Heine has already been mentioned (31–34 of this work). He declares that Mendelssohn learned the merits of Bach's music from someone else, and then put himself forward as a propagandist for it. The best feature of Mendelssohn's own work is its technical form. Rosenberg credits Mahler with lofty aspiration, but thinks

he reveals his Jewish character by "expecting the ultimate from a thousand-voiced orchestra." He condemns Schnitzler as a contriver of sensual effects. He speaks of the exaggerated mass effects of Reinhardt's "theater-circus." He declares that Jewish infant prodigies have showy technique but no genius or creative power. The Jews show their foreignness to European culture by promoting the spread of "nigger art" in all its phases. He finds in the Jews a "complete incapacity" for the visual arts, and believes that their efforts in such movements as futurism and expressionism are just one more proof of their impotence (364–365).

Rosenberg vigorously rejects the greater part of the art, music, and literature of recent decades because it lacks racial values and is variously tainted with internationalism, democracy, Marxism, and other Jewish vices. He scourges the German authors since Wagner for compromising with the bourgeois money power and the Jewish press; he is especially severe toward Gerhart Hauptmann. In drama, theater, and music he stigmatizes the influences from Paris, Vienna, Moscow, and New York as *foetor judaicus* and *Leichengeruch*—stink of Jewry and stink of death (444–447).

Nevertheless, he does not despair. In architecture, for instance, he feels that the Nordic spirit which created the Greek and Gothic organizations of space is beginning to create new and honest architectural forms. He mentions grain elevators in California, ships of the North German Lloyd, and bridges of the *Tauernbahn* in the Austrian Alps (385–386). In the statues

that commemorate the German soldier of 1914–1918 he finds a facial type of mystically significant uniformity—the vertical forehead deeply lined, the straight and vigorously angled nose, the tensely closed lips, the wide-open eyes gazing straight forward into infinite distances. In this type he sees an expression of the reviving spirit of Germanic manly will and racial loyalty, the spirit to which the future belongs (448–449). In the German churches of the future we shall not find depictions of the crucifixion, but of the fiery teaching spirit of Jesus, the hero in the highest sense. Instead of the gilded lead and plaster extravagances of Jesuit baroque ornamentation, there will be statues of the bringer of life [possibly Jesus] accompanied by the deity with the spear [presumably Wotan]. In the public squares statues of the World War soldier will be centers of a Germanic faith (616–618). A poet will arise who can fitly sing of the two million dead of the First World War, who sacrificed themselves for the honor of Germany. In revering them the German spirit will be reborn. This future German poet will purify the theater and guide in the creation of an heroic music; he will establish a new cult and a new myth. Thus art will overcome the world (450).

To sum up, art for Rosenberg is an expression of the racial soul. The best art is that which the Germanic artist produces in his struggle for self-expression. The worst art is that which the money-seeking Jew contrives for its effect on his audience.

SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

Rosenberg's ideas on social problems are few but important. In economics he rejects laissez faire and international finance (123, 202). All economic and legal arrangements must promote the vital, cultural growth of the racial state (574, 588–589). A sound peasantry with ample land must constitute the foundation of national life (534, 553). Huge cities are a detriment; they should be decentralized, and a fixed number of cities of various but limited sizes should be permitted to meet the needs of the nation (552–557). This requires the abrogation of the "right" to change one's residence (552).

Justice should not be considered an abstract idea applicable to men as such regardless of race. The criterion of justice should be the organic relation of each activity to the honor and interests of the racial state (566–567, 581). For this reason, the rights of Jews should be restricted; marriage with them should be forbidden "so long as Jews are permitted to live at all on German soil" (a sinister phrase). The propagation of the best racial elements in the state should be promoted by law, in spite of the objections of the Catholic Church (577–579, 595).

Rosenberg objects both to the extreme rigorism of the Church in sexual matters and to certain feminist demands for free love and legalized abortion (592). Monogamy is to be guarded and retained as the or-

ganic cell of folk life. But he cites with favor the contention of Professor K. A. Wieth-Knudsen that if the ancient Teutons had not at times practiced polygamy, the race could not have expanded, and the indispensable basis for Occidental civilization would have been lacking. When, as in Germany in 1930, the women far outnumber the men, ought millions of women to remain childless and be disdained as old maids? The coming Reich will find a way to retain monogamy, yet to give equal honor to mothers of German children, whether married or unmarried, and to give equal social and legal status to their children (592–593). He does not make it clear just how monogamy can be "retained" while concubinage for racial expansion is encouraged and concubines are honored as highly as wives.

In regard to the rights and activities of women, Rosenberg takes a reactionary stand. The agitation for the emancipation of women is a product of the ideas of the French Revolution, which of course he despises (493). Women, he thinks, lack constructive power. In the Middle Ages women were often better educated and had more leisure than their husbands, but they never matched the achievements of Walther von der Vogelweide or Roger Bacon. In recent decades they have had ample opportunities in many fields, but have not become anything more than mediocrities (497–498).

Man's soul is constructive, woman's is lyrical (513). Political and social achievements are initiated by cohesive groups of men (*Männerbünde*) such as the Athenian corps of youth (*epheboi*), the Catholic

priesthood, the Prussian officers' corps, the Nazi Storm Troopers (486–493).[70] The emancipation of women does not make them similarly constructive, but merely intellectual or erotic (504–507, 509). In the United States men devote themselves to the ruthless pursuit of the dollar; sport and technology are their only "culture." Every opportunity in art, science, and politics is open to women. The result is "the surprisingly low level of civilization in the nation" (501).

Woman is properly the guardian of spontaneous and profound inner life; she creates the lyrical atmosphere which often inspires the constructive achievements of man. Woman must be emancipated from her emancipation if she is to preserve the indispensable bases of civilization. The supreme mission of woman is to guard the purity of the race, which is now threatened by marriage with Jews, "nigger" art, and Jewish pornography. Women, he thinks, should have suitable opportunity for self-development, but judges, soldiers, and statesmen must be *men*. "The hardest man is only just hard enough for the iron future" (509–512).[71]

In short, Rosenberg's social program is racial and totalitarian. It has no concern for individual rights or individual happiness. Legal, economic, and social arrangements, including the distinctive functions of men and women, must be reformed to promote the aggrandizement of the German *Volk*.

VI

CRITICISMS AND REBUTTALS

CONTROVERSY WITH CATHOLICS

A CATHOLIC criticism of Rosenberg's *Mythus* was presented by anonymous scholars in *Studien zum Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts*. These studies were first circulated by the diocese of Münster, afterwards by other dioceses in late 1934 and early 1935, and finally by the publisher J. P. Bachem of Cologne.[72] This book is extremely rare in the United States, and I suspect that efforts were made to prevent its export from Germany. The book thoroughly discusses Rosenberg's treatment of the Bible and of Church history, and gives brief criticisms of his views on various religious and ethical problems.

Rosenberg replied to the *Studien* and other attacks, mainly Catholic, in a volume of 104 pages entitled *An die Dunkelmänner unserer Zeit* ("To the Obscurantists of Our Time").

This title will remind scholars of the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, a famous satire on priests and monks which appeared just before the Reformation. Thus in the very title of his work he seeks to discredit his opponents.

On the major issues it is obvious that no agreement can be reached between Rosenberg and his Catholic critics. Such issues are the authority of St. Peter and the popes, the intellectual validity and moral values of Catholic theology, the struggles between Catholics and heretics, and the relation between Church loyalty and national or racial loyalty. It is also of little use to discuss such matters here, as the reader is likely in any case to judge them according to his own predilections. On the level of moral, religious, and philosophical convictions, neither side can win a definite victory, but on the level of historical fact, it is sometimes clear that one or the other is right.

What is the relation between these two levels of discussion? In the preface to his third edition of the *Mythus*, dated 1931, Rosenberg remarked that the Catholic press had ignored all his historical assertions because they were unassailable, and ignored the *grounds* for his general views and demands (6). This implies that the historical surveys have an integral relation to his moral, religious, and philosophical views. In the *Studien* the integral relation between the two levels is asserted; Rosenberg's picture of the Bible, the Catholic Church, its history and doctrine, is decisive for the rightness or wrongness of his philosophical and religious aims (*Studien*, I, 1 n.).

But in replying to the *Studien*, Rosenberg changes his tune and asserts that his essential message for his epoch would retain its validity "even if the whole *historical* proof were to be refuted at every point" (*Dun-*

kelmänner, 6). Elsewhere (p. 68 of this work) I have indicated the relation of this utterance to his reliance on intuition.

Let us consider some of the controversies concerning historical facts. The claims of the contestants on this level are extreme. At the end of his discussion of Rosenberg's depiction of the history of the Church, the writer in the *Studien* declares that every single feature of that depiction is wrong (*Studien*, I, 84). Rosenberg, on the other hand, boasts that only five trivial errors in the whole *Mythus* were proved against him, and that none of his major or minor contentions were upset (*Dunkelmänner*, 66); not he, but his Catholic critics are *unwissenschaftlich*, that is, unscholarly, unscientific (*ibid.*, 44).

Let us first consider the five trivial errors which Rosenberg admits (*Dunkelmänner*, 66). He mistakenly described the historian Eusebius as a eunuch (*Mythus*, 74, *Studien*, I, 16). He called the members of the Council of Nicaea monks, whereas they were bishops (*Mythus*, 133, *Studien*, I, 21). In a list of alleged Catholic forgeries, Rosenberg included the so-called "Decree of the Emperor Gratian." In fact, the Emperor Gratian reigned from 375 to 383. The so-called "Decretum Gratiani" was the work of a monk named Gratian in the twelfth century; it is a work on canon law, attempting to harmonize a variety of earlier decisions from various nations and periods. Rosenberg admits that the Emperor Gratian forged no decree, but protests against being accused of confusing the Em-

peror and the monk. But if he did not confuse them, what in the world did he do? No explanation is forthcoming (*Mythus*, 524 n.; *Studien*, I, 58). Rosenberg said that Pope Hadrian VI ordered the execution of Arnold of Brescia; but his execution occurred in the reign of Hadrian IV (*Mythus*, 193, *Studien*, I, 46). Rosenberg cites "Merk" as a writer on the Gospels; the correct spelling is "Merx" (*Mythus*, 161 n.; A. Koch, "Der neue Mythus und der alte Glaube," *Stimmen der Zeit*, CXXVIII [1935], 79).

These are the five acknowledged errors, and we must admit that they are trivial. They are corrected in later editions of the *Mythus*.

Let us consider next a point on which Rosenberg has defended himself successfully. I do not say it is the only such point, as I cannot undertake to evaluate every issue in this voluminous controversy. According to Rosenberg, Pope Pius IX, in an address in 1874, called Bismarck the serpent in the paradise of humanity, and hinted at a possible avalanche which might sweep the German Empire away. In the *Studien* it was asserted that no such address was to be found in the collection of Pius IX's speeches. Rosenberg retorts that the passage was printed in the *Allgemeine Rundschau* for August 8, 1931 (*Mythus*, 470–471; *Studien*, I, 79; *Dunkelmänner*, 8; the Rev. Placidus S. Kempf has kindly verified the citation from the *Allgemeine Rundschau*.)

A question on which the outcome is somewhat ambiguous is that of "nine million murdered heretics" of

whom Rosenberg speaks in the *Mythus* (142, 167); in the table of contents he uses the sarcastic phrase, "nine million dead heretics on the pathway of love" (ix). In the *Studien* (I, 51–53) this extraordinary number is traced to an essay by Voltaire, "Dieu et les Hommes," chapter xiii.[73] There the irrepressible and irresponsible Voltaire concocts a list of persons "killed for the love of God." He does not say that they were all heretics. His list includes persons who perished in the Teutonic migrations occasioned by the conflict between Catholics and followers of Arius; one million victims of the crusades; two million victims of the wars of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries; and five million victims of the Spanish conquests in America. His total is 9,468,800. The number of persons said to have been executed as heretics is obviously no more than a small fraction of the whole. Rosenberg retorts (*Dunkelmänner*, 17–19) that the number is after all too low, and cites the Thirty Years' War, "instigated by Jesuits at the courts of Munich and Vienna," which reduced the population of Germany from twenty to eight millions.

Anyone who reflects on the complexity of historical causation and considers the nonreligious motives that contributed to these persecutions and wars will be inclined to laugh at this sophomoric exchange of figures. However, two more serious thoughts may occur to us. In the first place, after all possible deductions, the victims of religious persecution should be a heavy burden on the conscience of the Christian churches, Protestant

as well as Catholic. In the second place, the Nazis are primarily responsible for the millions of victims of the present war (Germans as well as non-Germans)—for the millions falling in battle and also for other millions who are victims of the Nazis' anti-Jewish policy and their depopulation program in Poland. In general, religious persecutors have offered the alternative of conformity or death. However little we may admire a hypocritical conformity, we may condone it under such circumstances. The victim, in a sense, "had a chance." But the Nazis are not appeased by conformity. Not the Jew's faith, which he can change, but his "blood," which he cannot change, is the excuse for his liquidation. As long ago as 1912 I heard in Germany the brutal couplet—

> Was er glaubt ist einerlei,
> Die Rasse ist die Schweinerei.
>
> (It's not the faith that they embrace,
> The swinishness is in the race.)

In seeking to fulfill Hitler's demand for tillable soil to support two hundred fifty million Germans in Europe within a hundred years,[74] the Nazis pursued a ruthless policy toward those who stood in their way. They did not wish merely to administer the eastern areas, but to clear them for their own race.[75] The persecutions carried on by Christian churches have been spread over many centuries, but the Nazis have accumulated millions of victims in a few years. The religion of race is more lethal than that of Christ or Mohammed.

Let us consider a few cases in which Rosenberg has failed to answer the attacks of his critics. Rosenberg strongly hints that Jesus was an "Aryan," saying that the Amorites "formed the Nordic stratum" in the region later called Galilee and that Jesus came from Galilee (27). He agrees with Chamberlain and Delitzsch that there is "no decisive proof" that Jesus was of Jewish origin. He thinks no scientific proof as to his origin will ever be possible, but that we must be satisfied with the probability of his non-Jewish origin—an assumption which he considers strengthened by Jesus' "un-Jewish, mystical doctrine of the 'Kingdom of Heaven within us'" (76 n.). He cites further a discussion by Emil Jung. In the *Studien* (I, 106 ff.) the flimsiness of these discussions is exposed. But in *An die Dunkelmänner unserer Zeit* Rosenberg makes *no reply*.

In the *Mythus* (604–605) it is said that the Gospel of Mark "knows nothing of Jesus as the 'fulfiller' of the Jewish Messiah idea." In the *Studien* (I, 109) Mark 14:61 ff. is cited. The passage reads, in Goodspeed's translation:

> The high priest again questioned him and said to him, 'Are you the Christ, the son of the Blessed One?' But Jesus said, 'I am! and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Almighty and coming in the clouds of the sky!' Then the high priest tore his clothing, and said, 'What do you want of witnesses now? Did you hear his blasphemy? What is your decision?' [76]

From Rosenberg, *no reply*.

In the *Mythus* we are told that because of the sever-

ity of Roman taxation and administration in Asia Minor, the oppressed population dreamed of a leader and liberator of slaves. "That was the legend of Chrestos. From Asia Minor the Chrestos myth passed to Palestine, was eagerly received, was blended with Jewish ideas of the Messiah, and was finally transferred to the person of Jesus" (74). The authors of the *Studien* could find no source for this view except a passage in the *Life of Claudius* by Suetonius, 120 A.D. (*Vita Claudii*, 25), stating that Claudius "drove out of Rome the Jews, who at the instigation of a certain Chrestos were continually raising disturbances." The form "Chrestos" is merely a variant of the Greek "Christos," since in the Greek of the period "i" and "e" were often interchanged (*Studien*, I, 6–7). (In modern Greek several ancient vowels have been replaced by "i.") Rosenberg is accused of developing a whole legend out of a Roman author's misspelling, but he makes *no reply*.

Regarding indulgences, Rosenberg says that "it was the African Tertullian who developed this commercial doctrine with great expenditure of legalistic ingenuity" (170). In the *Studien* it is asserted that Tertullian, born about 160 A.D., had nothing to do with the doctrine of indulgences, which was not developed until the Middle Ages (*Studien*, I, 22). From Rosenberg, *no reply*.

One of the most familiar of Christian legends is that of the vision of Constantine, recorded by Eusebius. During his campaign against Maxentius he was said to have seen a luminous cross in the sky, sur-

rounded by the words, *In hoc signo vinces*, "Under this sign thou shalt be victorious." Rosenberg refers to the cross as "the sign which overpowered the 'pious' Chlodowech [Clovis]" (681). The Catholic critic accuses him of shifting the legend from Constantine to Clovis (*Studien*, I, 35). From Rosenberg, *no reply*.

In accusing the Catholic priesthood of trying to deify itself, Rosenberg quotes the following passage from Berthold von Regensburg, *omitting* the phrases here placed in brackets: "Whoever submits to the power of the priest [with sincere confession and true repentance], for him the priest has the power instantly to close Hell and open Heaven [with proper penance according to God's grace and the condition of the man]" (226 note). To omit these clauses is to conceal the spiritual meaning of the passage and leave it open to the "magical" interpretation by which Rosenberg seeks to discredit the Church. The Catholic critic points out the omissions (*Studien*, I, 62–63). From Rosenberg, *no reply*.

It is interesting to note that even as late as 1938 Rosenberg continued to print without change these passages concerning the non-Jewish origin of Jesus, the Gospel of Mark, the "Chrestos" legend, Tertullian, Clovis, and Berthold von Regensburg.

Rosenberg indulges in some curious speculations about the "round" type of building, which he associates with the despised Etruscans, and the "rectangular" type, which he associates with the noble Nordics. In the *Studien* it is pointed out that he says the original

dome form of St. Peter's in Rome was changed to a basilical (rectangular) form by Bramante (384). In fact, both Bramante and Michelangelo used a plan in which a dome was to surmount a building whose floor plan embodied the Greek cross (all four arms equal), as anyone may see who will look in Baedeker's *Central Italy*. The eastern nave, extending the floor plan to form a Latin cross, was planned by Maderna (*Studien*, I, 72). From Rosenberg, *no reply*. Citations in the *Studien* are from the 17.–20. *Auflage* of the *Mythus*, 1934. In the 91.–94. *Auflage*, 1936, which lies before me, the reference to Bramante is omitted; thus Rosenberg silently acknowledges the error.

In view of these facts, how can Rosenberg say that only five errors were proved against him?

The authors of the *Studien* have performed a valuable service by demonstrating in detail the defectiveness of Rosenberg's scholarship and the perversity of his interpretations. That is the chief aim of the work. It is not a general defense of truth and humanity against Rosenberg. It does not attack his sneer at "nigger" bishops celebrating mass at the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago (167–168), although, by indicating the Church's reasons for developing native clergy, it indirectly rebukes his arrogance (*Studien*, V, 35). It asserts that all human races are closely related, and calls attention to the extraordinary progress of the American Negro in taking over the achievements of civilization (*ibid.*, 34), but it does not attempt a general refutation of his Aryan myth. It says:

> That there are different racial dispositions, no one will deny, nor that thereby . . . certain lines of possible ethical development are foreshadowed (*ibid.*, 15).

> That every race by its endowment brings with it a *particular question to the world* and accordingly has a special problem to solve, and that here differences of value in the level of talent are present, is to the Catholic an obvious truth. He can accept any solution that does not in a naturalistic fashion destroy moral freedom (*ibid.*, 17).

It is asserted that eugenic programs can be developed within the framework of Catholic ethics, which has always sought to keep the family sound (*ibid.*, 21). We are told, in a fashion conciliatory towards National Socialism, that the absolute ethics of Catholicism do not condemn but encourage the development of distinct "ethos-forms" for different sexes, peoples, nations, classes, and vocations (*ibid.*, 34–35). It does not attack Rosenberg's contention that when the female population decidedly exceeds the male, concubinage is justified. Above all, it does not attack his anti-Semitism nor his demand that the lands of Germany's eastern neighbors be cleared to make room for her peasants.

Part V of the *Studien*, dealing with basic ethical and religious issues, is much weaker than the other four parts dealing with historical facts. Perhaps the editors felt that other Catholic writings and sermons had sufficiently exposed the moral defects of Nazism and that the chief function of this work was to discredit Rosenberg's historical scholarship. On the other hand, Kolnai reports a number of Catholic writings which, instead

of warning against the evils of Nazism, strive to show an essential harmony between Nazism and Catholicism.[77]

CATHOLICISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

In spite of the tendency of some Catholics to appease the Nazis and Fascists or to succumb to anti-Semitic influences, the official position of the Church on anti-Semitism is clear. An old writer on canon law says:

> Christians should cherish towards the Jews the same benignity which they would wish their own brethren who live in pagan lands should enjoy from the pagans.[78]

A decree of the Holy Office of September 25, 1928, declares:

> The Catholic Church habitually prays for the Jewish people, who were the bearers of the divine revelations up to the time of Christ; this despite, indeed on account of, their subsequent blindness. Actuated by this love, the Apostolic See has protected this people against unjust oppression and, just as every kind of envy and jealousy among the nations must be disapproved of, so in an *especial manner* must be that hatred which is generally termed anti-Semitism.[79]

In 1938, after Mussolini began to take anti-Semitic measures, Pope Pius XI reiterated the position of the Church. Addressing students of the College of Propaganda, he said:

> Catholic means universal, not racist, not nationalist in the separatist sense of the two adjectives. . . . We are not willing to make any separation in the human family. . . . Human worth consists in this: that all men form a single family, the human species, the human race.[80]

Again in the same year, addressing Belgian pilgrims, he recalled the mention of Abraham in the Mass and added:

> Note that Abraham is called our patriarch, our ancestor. . . . Through Christ and in Christ we are Abraham's descendants. . . . It is not possible for Christians to take part in anti-Semitism. . . . We are all Semites spiritually.[81]

This statement is in line with Galatians 3, especially verse 29: "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Both Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII have given positions in the research institutions of the Vatican to Jewish scholars who were forced out of Italian universities. Thus they have demonstrated that the doctrines cited above are not a mere show of words.[82]

The Church has undertaken a world-wide propaganda against the Nazi and fascist deification of race and state. The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities sent a letter in May, 1938, to all dependent institutions, urging teachers to "arm themselves from biology, philosophy, apologetics, and the juridical moral disciplines to reject validly and learnedly" eight doctrines characteristic of Nazism and Fascism.[83]

In the summer of 1942 the Vichy government began

to round up foreign Jews who had entered France since 1936. Fathers were separated from their families and sent to forced labor in eastern Europe. According to the London *Tablet*, the Papal Nuncio made a formal protest against these measures. Laval rejected the protest, saying that "he could not be influenced by the Holy See." [84]

At this time Monseigneur Jules Saliège, Archbishop of Toulouse, wrote a pastoral letter to his diocese which included these touching and courageous words:

> My very dear Brethren, there is a Christian ethic, a human ethic, which imposes duties and recognizes rights. Those duties and rights are common to human nature. They are derived from God. They can be violated, but no mortal has the power to suppress them. It has been reserved to our times to see the sad spectacle of children, women and men, fathers and mothers, treated like a common herd, and members of one and the same family separated from each other and sent off to an unknown destination. Why does the right of sanctuary no longer exist in our churches? Why are we conquered? Lord have mercy upon us. Pray for France, Our Lady. In our diocese, scenes of horror have taken place in the camps of Noe and Restebedoud. Jews are men. Jews are women. Everything is not permissible against them, against these men or women, against these fathers and mothers of families. They form part of the human race. They are our brethren like many others. A Christian cannot forget that. France, beloved Motherland, France who carries in the conscience of all her children the tradition of respect for the human person, chivalrous and generous France—I have no doubt you are not responsible for this terror.[85]

CONTROVERSY WITH PROTESTANTS

The Catholics, however, were not the only ones to attack Rosenberg's views. The chief Protestant reply to the *Mythus* was made by the theologian, Walter Künneth. His *Answer to the Myth* appeared in 1935.[86] It is a volume of over two hundred pages. It deals far less with historical details than do the *Studien*. It serves chiefly to elaborate the obvious thesis that Rosenberg's views are irreconcilable with the supernatural theology and ethics of conservative Protestantism. This is no doubt a valuable warning to orthodox Protestants, but it goes no further. Like the *Studien*, it contains no vigorous attack on aggressive racialism or anti-Semitism. Künneth himself appears to be an adherent of Nazism, though not in its Rosenbergian form.[87]

Rosenberg replied to Künneth and other Protestant critics in a volume called *Protestant Pilgrims to Rome, the Betrayal of Luther, and the Myth of the Twentieth Century*, which appeared in 1937. In it he complains bitterly that the Protestant churches in Germany have not fought atheistic Marxism but have resisted Nazism. He complains that they stress law, revelation, church, and creed, putting them above "the vital necessities of the German people striving for inner and outer freedom." He considers that in so doing they move back toward Rome instead of forward with the German *Volk* life. Interpreting Luther's work as a Germanization of the Church and an emancipation from Rome,

he insists that the Nazis, not the orthodox Protestants, are continuing Luther's work. Thus the Protestants are "betraying Luther" if they refuse to accept Nazi control of their churches.[88]

The phrase "Protestant Pilgrims to Rome" in Rosenberg's title refers to the fact that some Protestants, under the pressure of Nazi policies, have sought a closer co-operation with the Catholic Church, or have actually joined it. They had ample reason to feel that real Christianity could no longer maintain itself in the Protestant Church because of Nazi interference with its government. Professor Karl Thieme, for instance, sought to have his congregation and himself admitted to the Catholic Church on the ground that the values of the Reformation were safer in the present Catholic Church than in the Nazified Protestant Church.[89] The Catholic authorities could not admit a whole congregation as a unit, but Thieme was soon admitted as an individual and thus became definitely a "pilgrim to Rome."

It is absurd, however, for Rosenberg to attack as "pilgrims to Rome" those Protestants who merely wished to stand where Luther stood. Luther rejected the Papacy, the priesthood, monasticism, and certain sacraments. But he held fast to the Bible and to the universal mission of the Church. Rosenberg accuses such Protestants of *returning* to Rome because they wished to move no further from it than Luther did. He accuses them of *betraying* Luther because they believe what Luther believed, instead of rejecting most of the

Bible and reducing universal love to exclusively German comradeship.

The extreme to which the Germanization of Christianity was being carried is well illustrated by Reich Bishop Müller's revision of the Sermon on the Mount. The following parallels will show his line of thought:

MATTHEW 5 (KING JAMES VERSION)	VERSION OF REICH BISHOP MÜLLER, 1936
4 Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.	Happy is he who bears his suffering like a man; he will find strength never to despair without courage.
5 Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.	Happy is he who is always a good comrade; he will make his way in the world.
9 Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.	Happy are they who keep peace with their fellow-countrymen; they do the will of God.
44, 45 Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you; that ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven.	If you would be God's children, you must be on good terms with your fellow-countrymen and comrades. Behave like a comrade not only towards a friend but also towards an adversary. Keep calm and collected even if you are spitefully treated; try to preserve a noble and quiet bearing even to those who insult and persecute you.[90]

It is no wonder that many Protestants considered their church unsafe for Christianity with men like Müller in control.

THE OUTCOME OF THE CONTROVERSY

In the controversy between Rosenberg and his critics we see that Rosenberg left some of their most effective attacks unanswered, but retorted with ill-founded accusations. On the other hand, we cannot feel wholly satisfied with the replies of Künneth and the authors of the *Studien*. There were doubtless in the 1930's many young Germans who were not impressed by supernaturalism in either its Catholic or its conservative Protestant forms. They might be convinced by the *Studien* that Rosenberg was not too good a scholar, but still be attracted by his racial mysticism and inflamed by his attacks on the Jews. There was need of a book, written in a popular style and on a broadly human basis, which might have warned Germans of all creeds and no creed, of all parties and no party, against this perverse but seductive "myth" with all its sinister implications. Such a book might have revived in modern form the ideals that inspired Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe. No doubt there were many anti-Nazi articles and sermons from various angles, but if there was a comprehensive book of wide appeal, such as I describe, it has not come to my attention.

The controversy, however, was not allowed to proceed on an intellectual plane. In 1935 the government

began to silence Rosenberg's opponents. Micklem reports the early steps in this process as follows:

> In March . . . the public discussion of the *Mythus* was forbidden in Bavaria, lest it lead to a breach of the peace; there was a police regulation in the Rhineland in April forbidding the Church to criticize the fundamentals of National Socialism; in April a law was promulgated by which two lists of books were to be drawn up under the control of Goebbels and Rust; the first was to contain a list of books forbidden as endangering National Socialist culture; the second was to contain the titles of literature that was "undesired" and was consequently to be unobtainable through the usual channels. In April Monsignor Leffers was condemned to eighteen months' imprisonment with costs for discussing the *Mythus* with three students who had come to consult him; this was under the law against malicious attacks on state and party. Herr Rosenberg's protests that his ideals were unofficial was a flimsy pretext covering the determination of the Party to indoctrinate the youth of the country with the philosophy of National Socialism.[91]

In his *Mythus* Rosenberg had asserted that the "Medicine Man," i.e., the Pope, could not tolerate independent thought among his followers; he must strive to eradicate it with every means at his command; he must suppress, with index (of prohibited books), fire, and sword, all investigation that might lead to results contrary to his doctrine; he must imprison Roger Bacon and Galileo and ban the writings of Copernicus (173). The methods which the *Mythus* condemned when used by the Pope were used in defense of the *Mythus!*

Surveying the controversy we may say that Rosen-

berg's critics have succeeded in discrediting his historical scholarship in spite of his attempts at rebuttal. They have made it perfectly clear that his views are at odds with traditional Protestantism and Catholicism, a fact which he had no wish to deny. The controversy was not allowed to follow its natural course; government agencies intervened to silence Rosenberg's opponents.

RETROSPECT ON THE *MYTHUS*

What shall we say of the *Mythus* after surveying it and the controversies aroused by it? On the credit side we must admit the sincerity of Rosenberg's yearning for a rebirth of Germany freed from avarice, selfish competition, class divisions, and superstition. We must admit the somber baroque eloquence with which he pleads his cause. We must admit the great quantity of his reading and the skill with which he has organized his data. But on the debit side we must conclude that sincerity, eloquence, and argumentative skill in a fanatic only serve to make him more dangerous. His premises in regard to race are false, and vitiate most of his arguments. Uncritical reading organized in defense of prejudices does not make a scholar. Many details of his work are inaccurate. In his use of the Protocols, and in evading criticisms of the *Mythus* which he cannot answer, he is dishonest. His zeal for a better Germany is poisoned by his hatred of Catholicism and the Jews. What he demands for Germany in its foreign relations is not justice and co-operation but the sub-

jection of neighboring states and the depopulation of vast areas to permit German expansion. What he demands of his fellow Germans is not loyalty to humane ends but servile support of inhumane policies. The *Mythus* is brilliant propaganda for evil ends.

VII

ROSENBERG IN ACTION

HIS PERSONALITY AND STATUS

ROSENBERG is best known through his writings. Yet he has been an important member of the Nazi party almost since its founding. It is therefore natural to ask what his role has been as a man of action in the party and in the state. How far has he been effective in forming policies and executing them?

This question is hard to answer for several reasons. The processes by which Nazi policy is formed are secret. There have been perennial feuds between different leaders, so that there is often no unified policy in operation. It is hard, moreover, to know how far to trust the reports of insiders like Ludecke, Strasser, and Rauschning, who have some ax to grind, or outsiders like Henri, Shirer, and Huss, whose sources of information may be inadequate or biased.

The influence of a Nazi leader depends on his own personality, his relation to the *Fuehrer*, and his relation to other leaders. Let us begin with Rosenberg's personality. He is described as tall, blond, of vigorous physique, predominantly Nordic in appearance, with heavy and irregular features, and with "pale, lack-lustre

eyes that looked toward but not at you, as though you were not there at all." [92] The frontispiece of the present volume reproduces the photograph which Rosenberg used in the *Mythus* as late as 1936. It shows a face of the familiar blond German type, with apparently regular features; the expression is earnest and a little troubled. In an edition of 1938, this photograph is replaced by one showing a severer, not to say more truculent, expression. On the other hand, a photograph reproduced in *Caesars in Goose Step* shows him at a banquet table, relaxed and smiling. Both the later pictures indicate a gain in weight.[93]

He retains a Baltic accent. He is regarded as cold, reserved, and haughty—traits considered characteristic of Baltic Germans. His private life is such that opponents find nothing to condemn in it. His first wife died of tuberculosis in the 1920's. He married again, and has a daughter of whom he is said to be especially fond. His dress and mode of life are extremely simple.

His intellectual interests and his varied fund of literary and historical information form a contrast to the practical shrewdness and scanty education of many Nazi leaders. He lacks the intense personal ambition and the dynamic drive to action of other Nazi chiefs. On the other hand, he has been tenacious in defending his unalterable convictions. Ludecke describes the party dogma as "becoming an accordion in Hitler's hands", while Rosenberg remained "a Nazi fundamentalist." [94]

His coldness and aloofness, his moral and intellectual

superiority, and his obstinate adherence to principle could not make him popular with other leaders. He seems to have avoided taking sides in their intrigues against one another. His political strength lies in his relation to the *Fuehrer*. Apparently he has always had a genuine devotion to Hitler, and Hitler in turn has prevented any intrigues against Rosenberg from going too far.

While Hitler was imprisoned at Landsberg near Munich, Rosenberg served as leader of the Nazi party. He visited Hitler nearly every day. He may have had a hand in the first volume of *Mein Kampf*, which Hitler was then writing. The second volume, written a few years later, may also have been influenced by Rosenberg. Volume I, chapter xi, and Volume II, chapters i, ii, iv, xiii, and xiv, have much in common with the *Mythus*. We can only guess how much Hitler owed to Rosenberg. Hitler was unquestionably a Nationalist and an anti-Semite before they met. In view of Rosenberg's superior learning it is natural to suppose that he helped with the more elaborate historical and theoretical chapters.

Rosenberg, as previously noted, has been editor of the *Völkischer Beobachter*, which is the leading Nazi newspaper, since 1921. He founded the *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* in 1931 and has been its editor ever since; it is the foremost Nazi monthly. He has published many essays and made many public addresses. But these have usually been general in character and without any immediate practical effect.[95]

ROSENBERG, ENGLAND, AND RUSSIA

Rosenberg went on a semiofficial mission to London in May, 1933, while negotiations on disarmament were proceeding in Geneva. He saw Vansittart, Permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Sir John Simon, Foreign Secretary, and Lord Hailsham, Secretary for War. He also saw the United States' roving ambassador, Norman Davis. He spent a weekend at the country place of Sir Henri W. A. Deterding, the great oil magnate, whose properties in the Caucasus had fallen into Soviet hands; we may guess that they enjoyed each other's anti-Russian sentiments.

In his interview with Sir John Simon he is reported to have ruined his chances at the start by demanding that Germany be permitted to make small quantities of certain weapons which the disarmament conference was seeking to abolish.

> Sir John retorted that such a concession was impossible and "bluntly told the guest of the nation-wide reaction that had followed Nazi persecution of the Jews." Dr. Rosenberg then issued an "unprecedented threat which, coming from a man of no official standing, . . . caused indignation among Sir John's fellow ministers." [96]

The nature of this threat was not revealed.

Rosenberg laid a wreath, adorned with a swastika, at the foot of the Cenotaph War Memorial. It was removed by an English veteran of the First World War and flung into the Thames. When the veteran was

brought to trial he said, "I removed it as a deliberate protest against the desecration of our national war memorial."

Rosenberg received more than a hundred journalists at his hotel and harangued them for half an hour in German, which they did not understand. His companion, Count Bismarck, finally consented to give a brief summary in English. He replied reluctantly to a few questions, saying, among other things, that there had been more killings in Chicago than in Germany under Nazi rule.

In Parliament Leftists demanded to know why this fascist agitator was permitted in London when Trotsky had recently been refused admission to England.[97]

His visit, which was intended to promote better understanding between England and the Nazis, served only to arouse hostility between them. This fiasco destroyed any prospect Rosenberg may have had of becoming Foreign Minister.

Moreover, Rosenberg's appointment would have antagonized Russia as well as Catholics throughout the world. At this period Hitler maintained two bureaus dealing with foreign affairs, one under Rosenberg and one under Ribbentrop. These served as a threat to keep the old-line diplomats of the Foreign Office in submission to the new Nazi government. It is not clear how much influence Rosenberg's office actually had in foreign affairs. Ribbentrop later became Foreign Minister.

Rosenberg is supposed to have been consistently anti-Russian and desirous of an accord with Britain, while

Ribbentrop was hostile to Britain and sought an understanding with Russia. Journalists, therefore, spoke of Rosenberg as being discredited by the nonaggression pact with Russia. But this was a superficial view. In *Mein Kampf* Hitler proposed to crush France first and then conquer land in eastern Europe. It is now clear that Hitler never meant to keep the pact with Russia beyond a limited period. To keep Russia quiet by a temporary pact may have been a policy upon which Hitler and Rosenberg were perfectly agreed.

ROSENBERG AND THE CHURCHES

Ever since 1933 there has been a conflict between the Nazi regime and the Catholic Church. The Nazis have also fought with orthodox Protestants for control of the organization of the Protestant Church. These struggles have been very complex, and much of the activity has been secret. Such administrators as Rust, Müller, Kerrl, and von Schirach have publicly borne the brunt of the struggle. But Rosenberg, as supervisor of the ideological aspects of the Nazi movement, may have exerted an influence behind the scenes.

In this connection it is interesting to note a statement made by Rosenberg in an address to the Party Congress at Nuremberg in 1937:

> The churches had the grand opportunity of putting their work at the disposal of Adolf Hitler, as the new State was being built up, and of marching with him. They have let the opportunity slip, and when one does not, or will not, recognize

such chances of world-history, one has oneself spoken the verdict of destiny.[98]

In short, the churches have missed the bus, according to Rosenberg. In fact, however, it is the Nazis who have missed their chance to secure a greater unity of public sentiment in Germany. We have the word of Germany's most conspicuous Protestant theologian, Karl Barth, that the Protestants of Germany "almost unanimously welcomed the Hitler regime with real confidence, indeed with the highest hopes." [99] The Protestant Church was not alienated until the Nazis interfered in church affairs. The acquiescence of the Catholic Church in Italian Fascism shows that the Catholics could have made peace with the Nazis if the latter had not sought to impose a world view as well as a political regime upon Germany.[100]

Opponents of Nazism should be glad that the Nazis did not effectively conceal their heathen tendencies. By antagonizing devout Catholics and Protestants they left a block of anti-Nazi sentiment which may be helpful in forming a postwar regime in Germany. The churches, furthermore, were spared the infamy of further collaboration with anti-Semitic and antidemocratic Nazi policy. To whatever extent Rosenberg promoted Nazi interference with the churches, he contributed to this unintended result.

Some further light is thrown on Rosenberg's activity in the religious struggle by the thirty-point program for a National Reich Church, which he released for publication on January 2, 1942. This program had

not been officially adopted; it had merely been circulated among Nazi leaders and submitted to Hitler for action. Stewart W. Herman is convinced, however, that it represented the attitude of the men in power.[101] It is even more radical than the aspirations expressed in the *Mythus*. It eliminates all remnants of Christianity. Instead of calling for a fifth gospel to portray the real Jesus, it proposes to replace the whole Bible by *Mein Kampf*.

Some of the main features of the program are these:

Point 1 requires that all churches and chapels be turned over to the state. Point 2: ". . . The National Reich Church . . . is called to serve its single doctrine—race and people." Point 4: "Other churches or religious associations, above all those based on international bodies or directed from abroad, will not be tolerated in Germany by the National Reich Church." Point 5: "The National Reich Church is immutably fixed in its one objective: to destroy that Christian belief imported into Germany in the unfortunate year 800, whose tenets conflict with both the heart and the mentality of the German." Point 7: "In the National Reich Church . . . only the national 'orators' will be allowed to speak." Points 13 and 14 forbid the printing, dissemination, or importation of the Bible or other religious works or papers. Point 15: "The National Reich Church decrees that the most important document of all time—therefore the guiding document of the German people—is the book of our Fuehrer, *Mein Kampf*. This book contains the principles of the purest ethnic morals under which the German people must live." Points 18 and 19 demand that the Bible and cross be replaced on all church altars by *Mein Kampf* and a sword. Point 20: "The 'orators' of the National Reich Church, during their services, will ex-

plain to their hearers the contents of this book [*Mein Kampf*] to the best of their consciences and their knowledge." Point 30 requires that on all churches the Christian cross be replaced by the swastika, "the symbol of invincible Germany." [102]

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF ROSENBERG

In the *Mythus* (520–522) and in a special work, *Der deutsche Ordensstaat,* Rosenberg has outlined a project for a "German Order," a new, nonhereditary nobility to provide leadership for the Third Reich. He says: "The National Socialist movement has decided to select and unify from the mass of seventy million a nucleus of men to whom the special task of state leadership will be entrusted, whose members grow from youth on into the idea of an organic politics." [103] In 1942 Franz Neumann wrote, "Such an order has not been created yet, however, and we do not know whether it ever will be, but the ground work is being laid in the order castles where the élite of the party spend four years in training." [104] Rosenberg had supervision over the ideological training in these castles and personally quizzed teachers on their ideas before they gave instruction there.

In 1941 Rosenberg was appointed civilian administrator of the conquered parts of Russia. Pierre Huss describes him as taking larger offices for his new duties, which included the supervision of radio propaganda for Russia and of a network of secret agents in Russia. According to Huss:

His chief aides were and are today exclusively Baltic men, tricky and smooth as oil. They talk almost better Russian than German and know the Russians like a book. . . . Thus Soviet Russia will get a very thorough and fanatical taskmaster if it is changed perforce into Nationalist Russia. For Rosenberg and his young men work smoothly, persistently, and efficiently. Long experience and many setbacks in the Reich taught them never to take no for an answer, and they don't.[105]

From the data which I have been able to gather there emerges a fairly consistent and plausible picture of Rosenberg's practical activity. It has been persistently directed toward the goals outlined in the *Mythus*. It has been limited by the fact that he is more intellectual, less practical, and less ruthless in the struggle for power than some other leaders. Nevertheless, he seems to have influenced Hitler's mind in the early days of the party and to have had varying degrees of influence behind the scenes ever since. His mission to London was a failure. His part in the Church struggles remains undefined. His effectiveness as ruler of the Russian areas temporarily held by Germany remains to be determined. Historians will have to wait until official documents and private memoirs become available before they can properly evaluate Rosenberg's practical activity.

EPILOGUE

OUR study of the *Mythus* has revealed to us important aspects of the Nazi mind. In the first place, it helps us to understand the motivation of Nazi foreign policies, such as the attempt to seize land in Poland and Russia, to reduce non-German states to vassalage, and to depopulate Poland and France. It helps to explain such domestic policies as the conflict with the churches, the censorship of literature and the arts, the insistence upon remodeling education from the cradle, through school and *Hitlerjugend*, to the universities and the Order Castles.

In the second place, our study throws light on post-war problems, since the ideas and sentiments of the *Mythus* have permeated German education.[106] How can we deal in political, economic, and cultural matters with a people subjected to such an influence? How can Germans be re-educated to abandon their megalomania and take their rightful place in a co-operative world order? The problem will not be an easy one.

The Nazi philosophy will not be discredited by the mere fact of a German defeat, because it is itself a product of defeat. When Prussia was humiliated by subjection to Napoleon, Fichte arose to assure the Germans that their innate superiority would overcome all obstacles. Similarly, when Germany was crushed by

the defeat of 1918 and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the Nazis arose to give the Germans the same assurance. They explained that the German army was not defeated in the field, but stabbed in the back by Socialists, Jews, and Catholics. Germans might explain their defeat in the present war by some new excuse, and might cling with new tenacity to their faith in Germany's racial superiority. Only if the victors carry through a really humane and practical reorganization of world politics can they take the wind out of the Nazis' sails. In that case the Liberal and Catholic elements in Germany might re-educate their fellow citizens for participation in a better world.

In the third place, there are lessons to be drawn from the *Mythus* which apply to American problems. Racism is not wholly alien to the American mind. A strong sentiment of racial superiority was developed here in connection with Negro slavery. In some respects the Nazis have not caught up with the Old South. While it is true that millions of Poles and others are enslaved by the German government, even Goering in all his glory had no personal slaves. Our slave owners, like the Prussians and Rosenberg, exalted "honor," and readily died on the dueling ground or the battle field for the honor of self, family, or state. Like the Nazis they tended to ignore any obligations extending beyond their homogeneous group. Their preachers assured them on the lofty ground of Biblical texts that God had set the white race over the black.[107]

This is not merely a matter of the dead past, for the

successors of these slave holders still effectively deny to millions the rights which the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments were designed to establish. Nor is it merely a matter of the South, for the North shared in the Ku Klux Klan movement of the 1920's, and in dozens of quasi-fascist movements in the last decade.

Americans, like Germans, are only too susceptible to the propagation of racial and religious prejudices. None of our racial propagandists has matched Rosenberg in eloquence and the false appearance of scholarship, but some, like Stoddard and Grant, have done what they could in that direction. None of our fascist orators has been so effective as Hitler. But if our soldiers return from the present war to encounter an acute and prolonged depression, is it impossible that prejudices might be mobilized, that Negroes, Jews, and others might be made scapegoats, and that a wave of Fascism might engulf us?

We ought not, therefore, to view Rosenberg's volume with complacency, assuming that no American writer could be so perverse, and that no doctrine so ill-founded could gain currency in America. Rather we should take warning from the fact that gifted men *can* be so perverse, and that a public at least as well educated as our own *can* be so misled. We need great and eloquent books to expose and combat fascist tendencies in the United States. Of course there is even greater need of shrewd practical action to diminish the tension between social groups and to forestall a postwar depression.

Citizens of the British Commonwealth, too, may well ponder the significance of Rosenberg's propaganda. There was a British Fascist movement between wars. There were Tories who applauded the doctrines of Houston Stewart Chamberlain or who condoned the evils of Nazism and Fascism in their fear of Communism. Race problems are acute in South Africa and Australia, India and the Far East.

We should note also that German scholars were caught napping. To scholars the *Mythus* was obviously unscholarly; therefore they largely ignored it. Micklem says, "It is not surprising that before the Revolution few men of education had endured to read the *Mythus* and none to take it seriously." [108] Counterpropaganda against Nazism was too narrow, too little, and too late. After the Nazis had monopolized the education of youth and purged the universities of unsubmissive elements, it was no longer possible to defend truth and humanity in Germany. Scholars everywhere should give heed to a remark made by Franz Boas in 1936, "Hitler taught me that it is not only necessary to discover scientific truths about man; it is necessary to spread them in the world." [109]

Eternal vigilance is the price, not only of liberty, but of truth and humanity; and that vigilance must be directed, not only to the passive defense of those values, but to their active propagation.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1930).

2. Franz T. Hart, *Alfred Rosenberg—Der Mann und seine Zeit* (ed. 4; Munich, 1939), pp. 45–51. This is the source of most of the biographical data in this volume.

3. Franz Neumann, *Behemoth* (Toronto, New York, etc.: Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 141.

4. Throughout this volume, unless otherwise noted, page numbers in parentheses refer to *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts*, by Alfred Rosenberg (Munich, 1936, 91.–94. *Auflage*).

5. Alfred Rosenberg, *An die Dunkelmänner unserer Zeit* (Munich, 1935), p. 4. This is his answer to Catholic attacks, of which the publishers claim to have distributed over six hundred thousand copies. It is always possible that Nazi statistics are padded.

6. Pastor Heinrich Hueffmeier, *Rosenberg's German "Mythus," an Evangelical Answer* ("Friends of Europe Publications," No. 26; London: Friends of Europe, 1935).

7. *Mythus*, Preface of 1930, pp. 2–3; Preface of 1931, pp. 6–7; *An die Dunkelmänner*, p. 3.

8. *The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1940), p. 79; "Friends of Europe Publications" No. 66 (London: Friends of Europe), p. 4.

9. Henri Lichtenberger, *The Third Reich* (New York: The Greystone Press, 1937), p. 334, from "Evangelical Church Letter Submitted to Chancellor Hitler in June, 1936." Compare notes 91 and 106 in the present volume.

10. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1940), p. 968.

11. Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 95–98.

12. *Mythus,* Preface of 1931, p. 6.

13. Reprinted, by permission of the publishers, from *The Third Reich,* by H. Lichtenberger, Greystone Press, 1937, p. 332. Lichtenberger is quoting from an "Evangelical Church Letter . . . to . . . Hitler."

14. *Ibid.*, p. 206.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 206–215, 329–363; Stewart W. Herman, Jr., *It's Your Souls We Want* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1943), *passim;* Michael Power, *Religion in the Reich* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1939), *passim.*

16. *An die Dunkelmänner,* pp. 90–91.

17. Herman, *op. cit.*, p. 174; Power, *op. cit.*, pp. 127, 142–144.

18. New York *Times,* January 3, 1942, pp. 1, 10; Herman, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 ff., 297 ff.

CHAPTER II

19. Julian S. Huxley and A. C. Haddon, *We Europeans* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1936), pp. 88-101.

20. *An die Dunkelmänner,* pp. 65–66.

21. M. F. Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 13.

22. Montagu, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10, 28–48, 50, 60–61.

23. Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), I, 239. Quoted by permission of the Oxford University Press.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 131 n. 3.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 239.

26. From *The War Against the West* (1938) by Aurel Kolnai, p. 442. By permission of The Viking Press Inc., New York.

27. Eugène Pittard, *Race and History* (London & New York: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1926), p. 442; reprinted by permission of the publishers.

28. Xenophon, *Symposium,* in *Socratic Discourses of Plato and Xenophon* (Everyman ed.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.), pp. 187 ff.; Plato, *Symposium,* marginal pages 215–217.

29. Pittard, *op. cit.*, pp. 135–144.

30. Toynbee, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–62. Quoted by permission of Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

31. *Mein Kampf*, pp. 947–951, 978–979.

CHAPTER III

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 425–451.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 448.

34. Alfred Rosenberg, *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion und die jüdische Weltpolitik* (Munich, 1923 [ed. 1], 1924 [ed. 2 & 3], 1933 [ed. 4]).

35. Hugo Valentin, *Antisemitism Historically and Critically Examined* (New York: The Viking Press, 1936), p. 165.

36. Benjamin W. Segel, *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion kritisch beleuchtet* (Berlin; 1924); John S. Curtiss, *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 48–57, 95–106.

37. For his argument see his *Protokolle*, ed. 4, 1933, pp. 6 ff.

38. Hermann Rauschning, *The Voice of Destruction* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940), pp. 238–241.

39. Valentin, *op. cit.*; Lee J. Levinger, *Anti-Semitism Yes-*

terday and Tomorrow (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936), chap. xii.

40. Curtiss, *op. cit.*

CHAPTER IV

41. Walter Künneth, *Antwort auf den Mythus* (Berlin, 1935), p. 105. Compare *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, article "Galilee," and *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, article "Galilee." Rosenberg's reference to Galilee as "the Gentile district," *Heidengau*, presumably refers to Isaiah 9:1, "Galilee of the nations," which, according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, does not mean "district inhabited by Gentiles," but "district surrounded by Gentiles," because it was bounded by them on three sides.

42. *An die Dunkelmänner*, pp. 21, 23, citing Lagarde. The passages intended are apparently Genesis 12, 20, and 37–50; II Kings 9 and 10.

43. From Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The New Testament, an American Translation*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1923, by permission of the publishers. The point is discussed in *Studien zum Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne: J. P. Bachem, 1934 & 1935), Part I, p. 7, and Part IV, pp. 24–26.

44. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, tr. John Lees (New York: John Lane Co., 1910), I, 195–196.

45. Articles by Hauer and others are translated in *Germany's New Religion* (New York: The Abington Press, 1937); Ernst Bergmann's *Twenty-Five Theses of the German Religion* may be found in Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 326–328.

46. Chamberlain, *op. cit.*, I, 174–250; II, 57–70, 134–138, 156–158.

47. From *The Power and Secret of the Jesuits* (p. 20) by

René Fülöp-Miller. Copyright 1930 by The Viking Press Inc., New York. Quoted by permission of the publishers.

48. *Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* article "Jesuits." For further discussion see the passage cited from Fülöp-Miller; Leopold von Ranke, *History of the Popes* (translation; London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1912), p. 174; *Studien zum Mythus,* Part I, pp. 76–77.

49. *Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* articles "Demons and Spirits, Christian," "Indulgences," "Infallibility," "Inquisition," "Relics (Primitive and Western), Christian"; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge,* articles "Indulgences," "Infallibility of the Pope," "Inquisition"; *Catholic Eycyclopaedia,* articles "Anne de Beaupré, Sainte," "Chrism," "Exorcism," "Exorcist," "Indulgence," "Januarius, Saint," "Lourdes," "Relics."

50. His "Defense" against charges of heresy is printed in *Meister Eckhart, a Modern Translation,* by Raymond Bernard Blakney (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1941).

51. According to Rauschning, *op. cit.,* pp. 49–57, the private views of Hitler on religion are similar to Rosenberg's, but even more radical.

CHAPTER V

52. Blakney, *op. cit.,* p. 93, from F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des Vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1857), II, 2.

53. Blakney, *op. cit.,* p. 292.

54. *Ibid.,* p. 204, from Pfeiffer, *op. cit.,* II, 310.

55. Blakney, *op. cit.,* p. 288. The passages cited in this and the three preceding notes are reprinted from *Meister Eckhart, a Modern Translation,* by R. B. Blakney, Harper & Brothers, 1941, with the permission of the publishers. Thanks are due to the translator for calling attention to relevant passages.

56. Both the poem and the letter are printed by Max Hey-

nacher in *Goethes Philosophie aus seinen Werken* (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 408–409.

57. *An die Dunkelmänner*, p. 6.

58. Rauschning, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–233; Bella Fromm, *Blood and Banquets* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1942), p. 86.

59. Ruth Benedict, *Race: Science and Politics* (New York: Modern Age Books, 1940); Frank H. Hankins, *The Racial Basis of Civilization* (New York and London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926); Jacques Barzun, *Race; a Study in Modern Superstition* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937); Montagu, *op. cit.*; Huxley and Haddon, *op. cit.* Of these, the last two appear to be most thorough on the biological side.

60. Johann P. Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe* (Leipzig, 1895–1896), III, 156 (Sonntag, 14 März, 1830); *Conversations with Goethe* (Everyman ed.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.) pp. 357–361.

61. The record of Hitler's pledges is available in Adolf Hitler, *My New Order*, ed. Raoul de Roussy de Sales (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), pp. 326 (Austria), 520 (Poland), 531 (Czecho-Slovakia), 742 (northern states, Holland, Belgium), 687–688 (Russia).

62. Quoted from *The Voice of Destruction* (p. 110) by Hermann Rauschning. Courtesy of G. P. Putnam's Sons.

63. Inazo Nitobé, *Bushido, the Soul of Japan* (ed. 10, rev. and enl.; New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905), pp. 92–93; also cited in *The Clash of Political Ideals* by Albert R. Chandler (New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940), pp. 235–236.

In this connection Nitobé mentions Kent's utterance in *King Lear*, Act I, Scene i, and Mowbray's speech in *Richard II*, Act I, Scene i.

64. Rosenberg's statements about God are well summarized by Künneth, *op. cit.*, pp. 14–16.

65. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Monadology*, sec. 82.

66. A discussion of some of these points may be found in *Studien zum Mythus*, Part V, pp. 49–50.

67. Pittard, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

68. Jacob Epstein, *Let There Be Sculpture* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940), pp. 94, 114, 140.

69. For a discussion of the portraits of Pericles see Elmer G. Suhr, *Two Currents in the Thought Stream of Europe* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), pp. 133–134.

70. George F. Kneller, *The Educational Philosophy of National Socialism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), pp. 126–129, discusses the relation of such *Bünde* to education and cites Hans Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft* (Jena, 1921); Werner Pohl, *Bündische Erziehung* (Weimar, 1933); Alfred Bäumler, *Männerbund und Wissenschaft* (Berlin, 1934). Rosenberg here ignores the erotic aspect which some others have stressed.

71. Kneller, *op. cit.*, pp. 230–240, discusses the Nazi program for the education of women, which seems to be in accord with Rosenberg's ideas. Compare also Gregor Ziemer, *Education for Death* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941).

CHAPTER VI

72. *An die Dunkelmänner*, pp. 5, 7.

73. Voltaire, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1819), XXX, 332 ff.; or (Paris, 1879), XVIII, 232–236.

74. *Mein Kampf*, p. 979.

75. Rauschning, *op. cit.*, p. 137. The technique of depopulation which Rauschning describes was applied in Poland, France, and elsewhere.

76. From Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The New Testament, an American Translation*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1923, by permission of the publishers.

77. Kolnai, *op. cit.*, pp. 258–263 (attempts to reconcile Nazism and Catholicism), pp. 508–510 (Catholic anti-Semitism).

78. Quoted by Wilfred Parsons, "Nationalism, Racism, and the Church," *Thought*, March, 1939, p. 61.

79. *The Church and the Jews, A Memorial Issued by Catholic European Scholars*, tr. Gregory Feige (New York: The Catholic Association for International Peace, 1937), p. 16. Quoted by permission of the publisher.

80. Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), pp. 314–315, citing in French the Pope's address of July 28, 1938.

81. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

82. *The Commonweal*, December 4, 1942, pp. 187–188.

83. Press release of the National Catholic Welfare Conference for the week of May 30, 1938. These are the eight dogmas to be attacked:

> 1. The human races, by their innate and immutable character, so differ among themselves that the lowest of them differs more from the highest in the human stock than it does from the highest types of the brute creation.
>
> 2. The vigor and blood purity of the race are to be preserved and cherished by every means possible; whatever, therefore, leads to this end is in itself honest and licit.
>
> 3. From the blood in which the character of the race is identified flow all the qualities of men—intellectual and moral—as from their most powerful source.
>
> 4. The principal end of education is to cultivate the character of the race and to inflame the soul with a burning love of its own race as its highest good.
>
> 5. Religion is subject to the law of the race and must be adapted to it.

6. The first source and highest rule of the entire juridical order is the instinct of race.

7. Except the cosmos or the universe, nothing exists as a living being; all things, even man himself, are nothing other than various forms, through long ages appearing, of this universal living being.

8. Individual man exists only for the "State" and on account of the "State"; whatever of rights may pertain to them are derived solely from the concessions of the State.

Numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are doctrines which can be found in the *Mythus*. The pantheism of Number 7 is distinct from Rosenberg's tribal mysticism. Number 8 is Fascist rather than Nazi, since it exalts the state as such; Hitler and Rosenberg exalt it only when it is a *racial* state.

84. *The Tablet* (London), September 5, 1942.

85. *Ibid.*, September 12, 1942, pp. 127–128. Quoted by permission of the publishers of *The Tablet*.

86. Künneth, *op. cit., passim.*

87. Kolnai, *op. cit.*, pp. 120, 258, 409.

88. *Protestantische Rompilger, der Verrath an Luther, und der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1937), pp. 7, 10, 21.

89. George N. Shuster, *Like a Mighty Army* (New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935), p. 107.

90. Ludwig Müller, *Deutsche Gottesworte* (Weimar, 1936) as translated in *The Germanisation of the New Testament* ("Friends of Europe Publications," No. 64; London: Friends of Europe). Reprinted by permission of the publishers.

91. Nathaniel Micklem, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 126. Quoted by permission of the Oxford University Press. Micklem's notes cite the original sources of his information in German periodicals.

CHAPTER VII

92. Kurt G. W. Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 87.

93. William D. Bayles, *Caesars in Goose Step* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1940), opposite p. 133.

94. Ludecke, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

95. The material on the preceding pages is mainly derived from Ludecke and Hart.

96. New York *Times*, May 11, 1933, p. 1, citing London *Daily Herald*.

97. See the New York *Times*, the London *Times*, and the Manchester *Guardian* for May 6, 1933, and subsequent dates. Rosenberg's previous visit to London in December, 1931, had little importance.

98. Micklem, *op. cit.*, p. 82. Quoted by permission of the Oxford University Press.

99. *Ibid.*, p. 55 and note, citing *Cross and Swastika* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1938), p. 15.

100. Micklem, *op. cit.*, p. 60 and note. Micklem states: "A Church that can march with Signor Mussolini and approve the Japanese as a bulwark against Bolshevism could very easily and quickly come to terms with Herr Hitler if the question at issue were a matter of politics and not of *Weltanschauung*."

In discussing the attitude of the Vatican toward Japan, Micklem cites an announcement in the London *Daily Telegraph* of October 16, 1937.

101. Herman, *op. cit.*, pp. 45–48. He refers to versions circulating in 1941, not to the publication of January, 1942.

102. From an article entitled "Nazi State Church Plan Proposes to Oust Other Faiths and Ban Bible" by Daniel T. Brigham in the New York *Times*, January 3, 1942, pp. 1, 10, reprinted by permission of the publishers.

103. *Der deutsche Ordensstaat* (Munich, 1934), p. 11.

Cited by Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

104. Neumann, *op. cit.*, pp. 398–399.

105. From: *The Foe We Face*, by Pierre J. Huss, copyright 1942 by Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., pp. 175, 178, by permission of the publisher. See also New York *Times*, July 26, 1941, p. 3; November 18, 1941, p. 4; November 19, 1941, p. 22; November 24, 1941, p. 25. According to the *Times*, some of Rosenberg's chief aides were *not* Balts. Secret instructions by Rosenberg to officials in the East are reported by Arvid Fredborg, *Behind the Steel Wall* (New York: The Viking Press, 1944), pp. 224–225.

106. On Nazi education see Kneller, *op. cit.*, which contains numerous references to Rosenberg; also Ziemer, *op. cit.*

107. William E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919), chaps. III, V.

108. Micklem, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

109. *Time*, January 4, 1943, p. 52.

INDEX

Numbers in roman type refer to pages; those in italics refer to the notes at the end of the book. If a name or topic appears both in the text and in a corresponding note, the index refers only to the text.

Abraham, 43, 107
Alexander the Great, 85
Allgemeine Rundschau, 98
Alliances, 28
Amorites, 18, 31, 42, 101
Angelus Silesius, 58
Anti-race, meaning of, 30
Anti-Semitism, 5, 36, 40, 100, 119, 122; Catholic position on, 106-108; *see also* Jews, *Protocols of Zion*
Architecture: Greek and Gothic, 88; Etruscan and Nordic, 103
Arius, 99
Arnold of Brescia, 55, 98
Art: depictions of Deity in, 35, 86; theory of, 83-91
Aryans, 18-29; *see also* Races
Augustus, Emperor, 23

Bach, Johann S., 27, 89 (twice)
Bachem, J. P., 95
Bacon, Roger, 53, 93, 113
Baedeker, 104
Bäumler, Alfred, 70
Barth, Karl, 122
Barzun, Jacques, 70
Bayles, W. D., *Caesars in Goose Step*, 117
Beethoven, Ludwig van, 81, 87, 89 (twice)
Benedict, Ruth, 69
Bergmann, Ernst, 49
Berlioz, Hector, 89
Berthold von Regensburg, 52, 103
Bible: and Luther, 59, 110; and Rosenberg, 96; and slavery, 127
Bismarck, Count von, 120
Bismarck, Prince Otto von, 27, 28, 98
Blakney, Raymond B., vii, 50, 52-55
Blüher, Hans, 70
Boas, Franz, 129
Bramante, Donato, 104
Briefs, G. A., vi
Brigham, Daniel T., 102
Bushido, 77
Butler, Rohan D'O., 27, 78

Calvinism, 46
Caracalla, Emperor, 23
Carthage, 22
Catholicism (Catholic Church), 23-24, 43, 48, 82-83, 89; acquiescence in Italian Fascism, 121-122; and anti-Semitism, 106-108; criticism of *Mythus*, 95-108; encyclopedia articles on aspects of, 49; interaction with Nazis, 10, 49, 92, 93, 106, 121, 122; interaction with Teutonism, 49-56; rejection of eight Nazi or fascist dogmas, 83
Cato, 23
Cervantes, Miguel de, *Don Quixote*, 81, 87
Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, 5 (twice), 14, 21, 48, 49, 101, 129
Chandler, Albert R., 78, 63
Chivalry, *see* Knighthood
"Chrestos," 102
Christianity, 10, 23, 42-59, 77, 82; Germanized, 11, 43, 47-48, 60, 109-111, 121, 123; relation to

Christianity (*continued*)
political authority, 44-47; *see also* Catholicism, Eckhart, Protestantism
Christopher, St., 55
Church and the Jews, The, 79
Church, National Reich, proposed, 123
Civilizations and races (Toynbee), 15-17
Claudius, Emperor, 102
Clovis, 103
Commonweal, The, 82
Concubinage, 93, 105
Constantine, Emperor, 25, 102
Copernicus, Nicholas, 53, 113
Coughlin, Rev. Charles E., v
Council of Nicaea, 97
Courage, 74
Cross and Swastika, 99
Curtiss, John S., 40, 36

Dante, 56
Davis, Norman, 119
Deaths from: Nazi aggression, 100; religious struggles, 98-100
Delitzsch, Franz, 101
Democracy, 59, 71, 77
Deterding, Sir Henri, 119
Dewey, John, 66
Dodd, William E., 107
Donatello, 86
Duty, 76-77

Eckermann, Johann P., 72
Eckhart, Meister, 6, 56-58, 60-63, 79
Economics, 92
Edman, Irwin, 78
Education, 8, 124, 126
Egypt (Egyptians), 18, 80
Emerson, Ralph W., 24
England, 27-28, 119-121
Epstein, Jacob, 86
Etruscans, 22, 23, 103
Eucharistic Congress, 55, 104
Eusebius, 97, 102
Ezra, 35

Family and sex, 92-94, 105
Fascism: danger of, in America, v, 128; danger of, in British Commonwealth, 128-129; in Italy, 25, 122
Feige, Gregory, 79
Fichte, Johann G., 27, 126
Finance, 35
Flaubert, Gustave, 89
Foix, earl of, 55
Folk (*Volk*): and religion, 109; as dominant ideal, 27-28; in relation to other values, 66-69, 75, 77, 84, 94
"Folkish" (*völkisch*), *see* Folk
Ford, Henry, 41
Foreign affairs, *see* Nazi policy
Foundations of the Nineteenth Century, see Chamberlain
France, 29, 107-108
Fredborg, Arvid, 105
Frederick the Great, 27, 28, 76, 87
Frederick II, Emperor, 25
Freedom and Fate, 50, 74
Freemasonry, 29, 36, 44, 59
Fromm, Bella, 58
Fülöp-Miller, René, *The Power and Secret of the Jesuits*, 47, 48

Galilee, 42, 68
Galileo, 53, 113
German Empire, *see* Reich
Giorgione, 87
Gobineau, Comte Joseph Arthur de, 5, 14
God-in-the-breast (God of mysticism), 50, 57-58, 78-79
Goebbels, Dr. Joseph, 6, 70, 74, 113
Goering, Hermann, 69, 70, 127
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 35, 65-66, 71-72, 81 (Faust), 84, 112
Goodspeed, Edgar J., 46, 43, 76
Gospels, "fifth," John, Mark, Matthew, 43-44, 47, 101
Gothic architecture, 88
Gracchi, the, 23
Grant, Madison, 14, 128

Gratian, Emperor or monk? 97
Graves, Philip P., 38-39
Great Britain, *see* England
Greece (Greeks, Hellenism), 20-22, 50
Greek art, 84, 85, 87
Grünewald, Mathias, 86 (twice), 89

Haddon, Alfred C., 70, 19
Hadrian IV, Pope, 98
Hagen, 77
Hailsham, Viscount, 119
Hankins, Frank H., 69
Hart, Franz T., 2, 95
Hauer, Wilhelm, 49
Hauptmann, Gerhart, 90
Heine, Heinrich, 34, 89
Henri, Ernest, 116
Herder, Johann G. von, 27, 64, 81
Heredity, 14-15, 70
Heretics (heretical movements), 55, 98-99
Hermann, Stewart W., Jr., 123, 15, 17, 18
Hero in art, 86
Heynacher, Max, 56
Hindu, *see* Mysticism
Historical questions: in controversy with Catholic critics, 96-104; in relation to world views, 68, 96-97
History, racial interpretation of, 13-17
Hitler, Adolf: as orator, 128; autocracy of, 75; broken pledges of, 74; learned from *Protocols*, 40; *Mein Kampf*, v, 1, 9, 14, 27, 28, 36, 75, 100, 118, 121, 123-124; *My New Order*, 61; on race, 14, 15, 68-69; relation of, to Christianity, 10, 51; relation of, to Rosenberg, 4, 116, 118, 121, 125
Hölderlin, Friedrich, 89
Hohenzollerns, *see* Reich, Second
Homer, *Iliad*, 21, 24, 50
Honor, 50, 54, 69, 72-78
Hueffmeier, Heinrich, 6
Huguenots, 74, 88
Huss, Pierre, 116, 124-125
Huxley, Julian, 70, 19

Ignatius Loyola, St., *see* Loyola
Immortality, 51, 79-82
India, 19
Individualism, 59, 64, 75, 84
Indulgences, 51, 102, 49
Inquisition, 55, 49
Italy, 24-25, 29; *see also* Mussolini

James, William, 66
Januarius, St., 55
Japan (Japanese), 17, 29, 77, 100
Jehovah, *see* Jews, religion of
Jehu, 43
Jesuits, 10, 51-52, 75, 99
Jesus, 24, 42-44; Aryan? 7, 42, 68, 101; "Chrestos," 102; in art, 86, 91; teachings of, 24, 47-48, 60, 101, 111
Jews, 30-41, 81; art of, 89-90; emancipation of, 54, 59; religion of, 31-34, 42, 43, 59; rights of, to be restricted, 92; *see* anti-Semitism, *Protocols of Zion*
Joly, Maurice, 39, 40
Joseph, 43
Jung, Emil, 101
Justice, 92

Kant, Immanuel, 27, 50, 57, 63-64, 71, 78, 84; and Rosenberg, 49, 61, 63-64, 80
Kempf, Rev. Placidus S., vii, 98
Kerrl, Hans, 121
Kingdom of Heaven, 47, 101
Kneller, George F., 70, 71, 106
Knighthood, 54
Knowledge, theory of, 65-69
Koch, A., 98
Kohn, Hans, vi, 78, 80
Kolnai, Aurel, 17, 27, 105, 87
Kroner, R. J., vii
Ku Klux Klan, v, 128
Künneth, Walter, 42, 109, 64

Lagarde, Paul de, 5, 36, 42
Laval, Pierre, 83, 108

Leffers, Monsignor, 113
Leibniz, Gottfried W., 61, 64, 80-81
Leighton, Joseph A., 78
Leonardo da Vinci, *see* Vinci
Lessing, Gotthold E., 71, 112
Levinger, Lee J., 40
Lichtenberger, Henri, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15
Loneliness, Nordic, 81
Love, religion of, 48, 50-51, 52, 59, 63
Loyalty, 76-77
Loyola, St. Ignatius, 51
Ludecke, Kurt G. W., 116, 117, 92, 95
Luther, Martin (Lutheranism), 26, 46, 58-59, 109-110

Maderna, Carlo, 104
Männerbünde, 93-94
Mahler, Gustav, 89
Marcus Aurelius, 25
Martin, St., 54
Marx, Karl (Marxism), 31, 49, 59, 82, 90, 109
Mary, Queen of England (Bloody Mary), 55
Mary, Virgin, 52
Masons, *see* Freemasonry
Maxentius, 102
Medicine man, 53, 113
Mendelian laws, *see* Heredity
Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Felix, 89
Merx, Adalbert, 98
Messiah, 44, 101
Michael, St., 54
Michelangelo, 86, 104
Micklem, Nathaniel, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church*, 113, 98, 99, 100, 108
Milch, General, 69
Mohammed, 100
Moltke, Count Helmut von, 28 (twice)
Monogamy, 93
Montagu, W. F. Ashley, 14-15, 70, 21
Müller, Reich Bishop Ludwig, 111, 112, 121
Mussolini, Benito, 83, 106, 100
Mysticism, 7, 56-58, 62-63, 64, 67, 78-79; Hindu, 19, 53, 80
Myth, meaning of, 6
Myth of the Twentieth Century, The, v, 1, 1, 4, *et passim*; controversy over, 8, 10-11, 95-114; general character of, 6-8, 11, 114-115; influence of, 8, 11; relation to Nazi policy, 9-11

Napoleon I (Bonaparte), 72, 126
Napoleon III, 39
National Catholic Welfare Conference, 83
Nazi persecutions, 100
Nazi policy: on foreign affairs, 7, 8-9, 28-29, 74, 100; on religion and culture, 9-11
Negro, 17, 24, 29, 55, 104; art, 90; slavery, 14, 127
Neumann, Franz, 124, 3, 103
Niemöller, Martin, 11
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 66, 81, 89
Nitobé, Inazo, *Bushido, the Soul of Japan*, 63
Nordic, *see* Races
Nordic type in art, 85-87
Norman architecture, 88

Obedience, 51-52, 75
Odin, *see* Wotan
Old Testament, *see* Jews, religion of
Order, German (*Deutscher Orden*), 76, 124

Papacy, *see* Pope
Parsifal, 81
Parsons, Wilfred, 78, 81
Paul, St., 24, 44-47, 48, 49, 50, 51
Pausanias, 19
Pericles, 87
Perry, Ralph B., 78
Persecutions of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, 8
Persia (Persians), 19-20, 31

Personality (person), 49-50, 80-81
Peter, St., 44, 96; church of, 104
Pfeiffer, Franz, 52, 54
Philosophers, *see* Dewey, Eckhart, Edman, Emerson, Fichte, Goethe, Herder, James, Kant, Leibniz, Leighton, Marx, Nietzsche, Perry, Plotinus, Schopenhauer, Socrates
Philosophy: of India, 19, 61-62; of Rosenberg, 61-94; *see also* Philosophers
Pittard, Eugène, 20, 25, 86
Pius IX, Pope, 98
Pius XI, Pope, 10, 106-107
Pius XII, Pope, 107
Plato, 21, 28
Plotinus, 62
Pohl, Werner, 70
Poland, 36
Polygamy, 93
Pope (Papacy), 26, 55, 58, 60, 75, 96, 113, 49
Popes, *see* Hadrian IV, Pius IX, XI, XII
Postwar problems, v, 127-128
Power, Michael, 15, 17
Pragmatism, 66
Priest (priesthood), 51, 52, 103
Protestantism, 9-11, 109-112, 121-122
Protocols of Zion, 30, 36-41, 114
Psalms, 31-34, 89
Puritans, 24
Pythagoras, 21

Quisling, Vidkun, 83

Race mixture, 19, 20, 23, 24, 71
Race theory: Catholic condemnation of, 107, 83; in America, 14, 127-128; in British Commonwealth, 128-129; of Rosenberg and others, 6-7, 11-17, 61-62, 68-72, 104, 107, 83; *see also* Chamberlain, Gobineau
Races: Alpine, 13, 27, 71, 86; Aryan, Nordic, Teutonic, 7, 13-29, 69-71, *et passim;* Dinaric, 71; Jewish, *see* Jews; Mediterranean, 13, 71
"Racial chaos," 23, 26
Racial types in art, 84-87
Ranke, Leopold von, 48
Rauschning, Hermann, 40, 74, 116, 51, 58, 75
Reich, Second (Hohenzollerns), 28, 46, 98
Reich, Third, 28, 36
Reinhardt, Max, 90
Religion: Christian, *see* Christianity, Catholicism, Protestantism; Etruscan, 23; Germanic, 11, 53-54, 58, 78-79, 81-82, 91, 109-110, 121-124; Greek, 24; Hindu, 19, 50, 80; Jewish, 30-34, 43, 59; universal, 82-83
Religious problems, 78-83
Rembrandt, 81, 89 (twice)
Revolution, French, 39, 59
Ribbentrop, Joachim von, 120-121
Rome, 22-24
Rosenberg, Alfred, *passim; An die Dunkelmänner unserer Zeit*, 95-104, 5, 7, 16, 20, 42, 57, 72; and the churches, 121-124; *Blut und Ehre*, 69; criticism of his works suppressed, 8, 10, 112-113; *Der deutsche Ordensstaat*, 76, 124; England and Russia, 119-121; *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts*, see *Myth of the Twentieth Century;* personality and activities, 3-6, 79, 116-125; *Protestantische Rompilger*, 109-111; Protocols, edition of, 38-42
Round and oblong buildings, 103-104
Roussy de Sales, Raoul de, 61
Russia, 4, 5, 9, 74, 100, 119, 124-125
Rust, Bernhard, 8, 113, 121

Sabine, G. H., vii
Sacraments, 51, 58, 64
Sales, Raoul de Roussy de, *see* Roussy de Sales
Saliège, Monsignor Jules, 108

Satan, 31
Sayce, Archibald H., 18
Schickedanz, Arno, 30
Schiller, Johann C. F. von, 71, 84, 112
Schirach, Baldur von, 8, 121
Schnitzler, Arthur, 90
Scholars and fascist trends, 40-41, 129
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 61, 64-65, 84
Schubert, Franz, 34
Schumann, Robert, 34
Segel, Benjamin, 39, 40
Sermon on the Mount, 47-48, 111
Shakespeare, 88; *Hamlet*, 81; *King Lear*, 63; *Richard II*, 63
Shirer, William L., 116
Shuster, George N., 89
Siegfried, 54
Simon, Sir John, 119
Sin, 23-24
Social philosophy, 92-94
Socrates, 21-22, 85
Sophocles, 87
Stoddard, Lothrop, 14, 128
Strasser, Otto, 116
Streicher, Julius, 59
Studien zum Mythus, vii, 95-106, 43, 48, 66
Suarez, Francisco, 52
Suetonius, 102
Suhr, Elmer G., 69
Sulla, 23

Tablet, 108, 85
Tacitus, 24
Talmud, 31, 35
Tertullian, 102
Teutons (Teutonism), 24-29, 49-56
Theodoric, 25
Theology, 31, 78-83
Thieme, Karl, 110
Thirty Years' War, 99
Titian, 87
Titus, Emperor, 22-23
Tolstoy, Count Lyof, 48
Torquemada, Tomás de, 55, 56
Toynbee, Arnold J., 15-17, 25
Trotsky, Leon, 120
Truth, "folkish," 7, 66-69
Type of human character, 51, 75; *see also* Racial types

United States, 29, 94
Universalism, 7, 64, 66-67, 83-84

Valentin, Hugo, 40, 35
Vansittart, Robert G., Baron, 119
Velasquez, Diego, 87
Veracity, 74
Verrocchio, Andrea del, 86
Vinci, Leonardo da, 89
Voltaire, François M. A. de, 99

Wagner, Richard, 5, 67, 81, 89
Walther von der Vogelweide, 93
Washington, George, 29
Wieth-Knudson, K. A., 93
Will and impulse, 64-65
Will-to-form in art, 84-85, 88-89
Wolz, Father George, vii
Women, status of, 93-94
World War caused by Jews, 39
Wotan (Odin), 20, 53, 54, 91

Xenophon, 28

Zelter, Karl F., 66
Ziemer, Gregor, 71, 106
Zionism, 35, 40
Zoroaster, 7, 19
Zuloaga, Ignacio, 87

Date Due

JAN 9 2003

O 14 '46

FACULTY

My 28 '47

MY 10 '49

MY 24 '49

MR 6-'51

AP 18 '52

OC 30 '52

JUN 15 1972

APR 30 '76

CB425 .R81C4
Rosenberg's Nazi myth / Albert R.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00132 5903